DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 232 465 FL 013 839

AUTHOR Allen, Edward D.; Birckbichler, Diane W.
TITLE The Development of Protocols to Help Teachers Understand and Interpret the Acquisition of a Foreign Language among Secondary School Students. Final Report, September 1, 1981-March 31, 1983.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Research Foundation.
SPONS AGENCY Office of International Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO RF-762891/714176
PUB DATE 23 Jun 83
GRANT G008102661
NOTE 132p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communicative Competence (Languages); French; Language Teachers; *Protocol Materials; Secondary Education; *Second Language Learning; Spanish; Videotape Recordings

ABSTRACT

This final report describes a project in which videotapes of secondary school students performing linguistic and communicative tasks at various levels of French and Spanish instruction were produced. The videotapes are intended to illustrate levels of foreign language acquisition to language teachers. High achieving students were filmed after 2, 3, 4, or 5 years of study in French or Spanish classes. The resulting protocols illustrate giving and taking directions in Spanish and French, interviewing a native Spanish speaker, French pronunciation, story retelling in French, cloze testing in French, and sentence combining in French. The tapes have been evaluated by consultants and teachers. An instructor's guide has been developed for each protocol to aid teachers in interpreting the students' performance. The guides, evaluation reports, and a reprint of a related article are appended. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Title VI, HEA,

RF Project 762891/714176
Final Report

ED232465

the ohio state university
research foundation
1314 kinnear road
columbus, ohio
43212

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROTOCOLS TO HELP TEACHERS UNDERSTAND AND INTERPRET THE ACQUISITION OF A FOREIGN LANGUAGE AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL ~~TEACHERS~~ Students

Edward D. Allen
Project Director

Diane W. Birckbichler
Associate Director

FL013839

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

For the Period
September 1, 1981 - March 31, 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
International Research and Studies
Washington, D.C. 20202

Grant No. G008102661

June 23, 1983

Final Report

to

The U.S. Department of Education
International Research & Studies

Grant # G008102661
RF Project # 714176

Title: The Development of Protocols to Help Teachers Understand and Interpret the Acquisition of a Foreign Language Among Secondary School Students

Project Director: Edward D. Allen

Associate Director: Diane W. Birckbichler

Table of Contents

A. Background Information and Statement of Purpose 1

B. Plan of Operation 2

C. Description of Materials Developed 4

D. Evaluation 5

E. Publicity and Dissemination 8

F. Director's Evaluation 8

Appendices

A. Copies of the Instructors' Guides for Each Protocol

B. Evaluation Reports from Off-Campus Consultants

C. Article entitled "Shared Nomenclature: An Analysis of Communicative Strategies Among Foreign Language Students," submitted for publication to Foreign Language Annals, May, 1983.

A. Background Information and Statement of Purpose

The project entitled, "The Development of Protocols to Help Teachers Understand and Interpret the Acquisition of a Foreign Language Among Secondary School Students," was begun in September, 1981, in Humanities Education, the College of Education, Ohio State University. An authorized extension permitted the project to be completed in March 1983.

The purpose of the project was to create videotapes of secondary school students as they performed linguistic and communicative tasks at various levels of instruction, i.e., after two, three, four and five years of study in French or Spanish classes. These videotapes could then be shown to preservice and inservice teachers in order to sensitize them to the levels of proficiency that could be attained among students who attended 40-50 minute language classes in public schools. A description of each of the videotapes is found in section C of this report.

The idea for this research stems from a previous project entitled, "Effect of Protocols on Teachers' Ability to Understand and Interpret Language of Young Children," completed at The Ohio State University through a grant from the U.S. Office of Education (1970-75). The focus of the above project was on <u>first</u> language acquisition among children in elementary schools (grades 1-6). Although the first-language protocol films provide a model for this proposal, their content would not be appropriate for second-language teachers. We believed, therefore, that what was needed was a series of protocol films that represented behaviors that would typically occur in the second-language learning situation and that could provide both information about and insights into the second-language learning process in much the same way that the first-language films represented linguistic development of children learning their first language.

B. Plan of Operation

In the Fall of 1981 the project director visited French and Spanish classes in the public schools of Columbus, Ohio and suburbs. The purpose of the visits was to marshall data, through observation, on the ways in which students at various levels of instruction were able to communicate orally with their teachers and with one another. Most of the teachers were kind enough to create situations, such as conversation circles, that would enable students to express themselves orally on a number of topics.

From a linguistic point of view the results were disappointing. It was clear that few students, even after three years of a foreign language, could produce a grammatically correct sentence. Their vocabularies were quite limited and their pronunciation very accented. What was more disturbing was that it was almost impossible to distinguish the proficiency of an "average" student in a second-year class from an "average" student in a third- or fourth-year class. This lack of articulation from one level to the next is currently being studied by several researchers, and is the raison d'être for the new ACTFL/ETS guidelines for proficiency levels in foreign languages.

Despite the poor performance of many of the students, there were a few in each class that demonstrated a high degree of language proficiency, especially in their ability to communicate simple ideas. It was, therefore, the director's decision to videotape only those students who showed that they were making concrete progress from one level to the other. The teachers were asked to select their "best" students for the project, with the additional request that they be outgoing and talkative.

The three public schools selected for the project were ones in which the foreign language departments made a concerted effort to help students develop their language skills and communicative abilities from one level to the next.

They were Columbus Alternative High School, Worthington High School and Upper Arlington High School.

The first videotape was produced on November 17, 1981. Its title was "Giving and Taking Directions in Spanish: Shared Nomenclature." Pairs of students were individually videotaped as they performed a communicative task. Although we considered the tape very successful in illustrating the concept of shared nomenclature, the technical director convinced us that we could get better technical quality in future productions if we filmed the protocols in the Teacher Education Laboratory at our University. All succeeding tapes, therefore, proved to be of better quality.

In the months that followed we produced nine more tapes, three of which did not show results that would be useful from a linguistic or communicative standpoint.

The total number of videotapes that illustrate clearly the concepts that we thought most valuable for preservice and inservice teachers is seven. They are described in Section C.

The ones that we rejected from our original proposal (p. 13) are number 3 "Retelling Stories With and Without Visual Cues," and two attempts at number 4 "Miscue Analysis."

Our reason for not including "Retelling Stories With and Without Visual Cues" is that we had already produced "Story Retelling," and thought that a second videotape on this topic would be too much like the first. Based on experiments that preceeded our study, it was quite clear that the results of retelling stories without and without visual cues would be too predictable.

Our reason for not including "Miscue Analysis" is that we obtained very few miscues in the students' reading. When this occurred with students in one school, we did the whole protocol over again with students from another school

with the same negative results. Our interpretation of the lack of miscue is that students at the secondary school level tend not to have enough experience with the foreign language, particularly in reading, to cause them to make miscues.

By the conclusion of our project we had produced seven videotapes and seven accompanying instructors' guides. Each guide includes general and specific directions for using the videotapes in classrooms or workshops, a review of the underlying learning theories, a viewers' guide and discussion questions.

Professor Birckbichler took the major responsibility for the instructors' guides. She was assisted by Dr. C. Allen Honeycutt, who edited the videotapes and produced the viewers' guide for "Sentence Combining," by Professor Virginia G. Allen, who produced the viewers' guide for "Story Retelling," and by Randi Weisberger, who transcribed the Spanish scripts.

C. Description of Materials Developed

1. Giving and Taking Directions in Spanish.

Three pairs of high school students perform this task--two from second-year Spanish, two from third, and two from fifth. Each pair sits at a table with a blind between them so that they cannot see each other. On one side of the blind is a picture; on the other side are the pieces of the picture. Student A tries to describe the picture in Spanish. Student B places the pieces of the picture on the blind (flannel board) as he listens to Student A's description.

2. Giving and Taking Directions in French.

Same format as #1.

3. Interviewing a Native Speaker of Spanish.

Four high school students separately interview native Mexicans who do not speak English. The students are in their second, third, fourth, and fifth year of Spanish respectively. Each student is asked to obtain as much information as possible from the native speaker he or she is interviewing.

4. French Pronunciation.

Three high school students of French, one from second year, one from third year and one from fifth year, do the following tasks: they read a short passage in French, pronounce a series of nonsense words containing French sound-symbol components, and repeat a series of French sentences of varying lengths and complexity.

5. Story Retelling in Spanish.

Three groups of three high school students from third, fourth and fifth year Spanish classes listen to a native speaker of Spanish as he reads a Spanish version of Snow White. Each group then relates in Spanish as much of the story that they can remember.

6. Cloze Testing in French.

Three nigh school students of French, one from second, one from third, and one from fourth year have finished circling their answers to a multiple item cloze test. Their French teacher then interviews them to discover their reasons for each choice.

7. Sentence Combining in French.

Three groups of high school students from second, third and fourth year classes attempt to combine orally a series of French sentences in as many ways as they can.

D. Evaluation

Phase I

Off-campus consultants, Professor Charles R. Hancock, University of Maryland, and Professor Genelle Morain, University of Georgia, examined the videotapes and portions of the Instructors' Guides. The latter were not complete at the time they evaluated the materials because we wanted these educators to offer us advice on the final copies.

The reports of the above consultants were very encouraging (see Appendix B). Professor Hancock wrote, "On the whole, you will see that I have found most things to my personal liking and very little to recommend in terms of changes. . . ."

Professor Morain wrote, "My reaction to the protocol videotapes is very positive. I have also showed them to two other foreign language education specialists, and graduate students in foreign language education. The global response to the tapes is excellent. Students felt strongly that they would have profited from viewing and discussing these protocols in their methods classes. The professors asked in one voice, 'Where can we get ahold of these?' I feel sure that the profession will benefit from having access to the protocol materials."

The major recommendations from Professor Morain were the following:

1. The instructors' guides should be quite specific on how the videotapes are to be used in the classroom. They should contain suggestions for "spin-off" activities, and insights that language teachers should keep in mind as they create testing and/or teaching strategies of their own.
2. When citing research studies, follow each study with a sentence or two pointing out the relevance of that particular study for the protocol at hand.
3. Answer sheets should be provided to all questions that have specific responses. Everyone who uses the tapes may not have a strong background in linguistics or in both French and Spanish.

Professor Hancock's suggestions for improving the instructors' guides were very helpful. He sent us a copy of a handbook he had developed as part of a foreign language project in New York. He recommended that we develop a format similar to his for each of the videotapes.

Teacher Evaluations

The videotapes and viewers' guides were shown to preservice and inservice teachers on many occasions to help us determine their effectiveness and ways in which they could be revised.

The following groups viewed and discussed the protocols:

a. Teachers from the Department of Defense Schools in a summer workshop at The Ohio State University, 1982.

b. High school and college teachers at the Fall Meeting of the Ohio Chapter of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, 1982.

c. Participants at the Fall Meeting of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1982.

d. Participants at the March Meeting of Central States Modern Language Conference, 1983.

e. Participants at the Spring Meeting of the Ohio Modern Language Teachers Association, 1983.

f. Participants at the Spring Meeting of the N.E. Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1983.

g. Several entire class sessions in methods courses in Humanities Education from the summer of 1982 to the present.

Phase II

We had hoped to compare the effectiveness of the protocol materials with an alternate form of presentation in our foreign language education methods courses. Unfortunately the enrollments in these courses were too small to allow for any significant experimentation.

Nevertheless, we utilized the protocols as a basis for concept development in the preparation of our preservice and inservice teachers. Their comments clearly showed that they had developed insights into the linguistic and

communicative stages in the acquisition of French and Spanish among secondary school students.

E. Publicity and Dissemination

Many secondary school teachers, college language professors and foreign language educators have seen the protocols and the viewers' guides. Our presentations of these materials at state and national professional meetings have helped us to disseminate much information about them. Participants at the OMLTA meeting, Central States Conference, the N.E. Conference and ACTFL convention are familiar with the materials developed through our grant.

At all of the above-mentioned professional meetings we distributed an information sheet with a list of the videotapes and a description of each protocol. We included the name of the Technical Director of the Teacher Education Laboratory at Ohio State University, Dr. Paul Peloquin, who has graciously consented to send the videotapes and instructors' guides to interested school and college personnel on a loan basis.

In order to make the materials easily accessible to students at Ohio State University, copies will be placed in the Edgar Dale Media Center and the OSU Listening Center at Denney Hall.

F. Director's Evaluation

The objectives of this project were the following:

1. To videotape samples of language behavior among secondary school students of Spanish and French at various levels of instruction.
2. To prepare a guidebook to accompany these segments that will help viewers understand and interpret the incidents in terms of the specific concept involved.
3. To evaluate the protocol materials and guides in terms of their usefulness and effectiveness.

I believe that we have successfully met all of the above objectives. We have produced seven videotapes that clearly illustrate samples of language behavior of secondary school students of Spanish and French. We have written instructors' guides and viewers' guides that will help foreign language educators as well as preservice and inservice teachers to understand and interpret the incidents of each of the concepts involved. We have shown the videotapes and guides to all the foreign language education students at Ohio State University and obtained their evaluations of these materials. At four state and national foreign language teachers conventions the materials have been viewed and discussed by the audiences.

Finally, we have received positive evaluation reports from two recognized authorities in foreign language teacher training--Professors Charles Hancock and Genelle Morain.

It has been a challenge and a pleasure to develop the materials that we described in our proposal. Judging from the initial reactions of the viewers, I believe that these protocols will be utilized effectively in many teacher training programs and workshops throughout the nation.

APPENDIX A

Instructor's guides

INSTRUCTOR'S GUIDE

GIVING AND TAKING DIRECTIONS IN SPANISH

The Development of Protocols to Help Teachers Understand and Interpret the Acquisition of a Foreign Language Among Secondary School Students

Director: Edward D. Allen, Professor, The Ohio State University

Associate Director: Diane W. Birckbichler, Assistant Professor, The Ohio State University

Consultant Editor: C. Allen Honeycutt, Assistant Professor, University of Northern Iowa

Developed in the College of Education, The Ohio State University, through a grant from the International Research and Studies (CFDA No. 84.0170) Title VI, Section 605, of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Instructor's Guides

The purpose of the instructor's guide is to provide instructors with pertinent background related to each protocol episode and to provide instructional materials to be used in conjunction with the protocol videotapes. The guides consist of separate sections to accompany each episode. Instructors may choose to use any or all of the sections outlined below:

*1. Background An introduction to the concept being observed and research related to the protocol episode is presented in this section. Instructors may choose to present this material orally to the students or allow them to read the information before viewing the videotape.

2. Description The protocol episode will be presented (e.g., a description of the task, information about the level of the students and participants, and other information related to the protocol).

3. Viewer's Guides These worksheets have been designed with a dual purpose: 1) to provide a focus to guide the viewer in identifying salient aspects of the concept under consideration on the protocol tapes and 2) to provide a basis for group discussions of the protocol episodes. In those cases where there are multiple worksheets, instructors may want to have different groups complete the various tasks during a single showing of the protocol tape. The different groups would then share their results with the whole group. Another alternative would be to show the tape several times and have each viewer complete each worksheet.

4. Implications for the Classroom Teacher This section provides a series of questions and activities that allow viewers to apply the concepts illustrated in the protocol tapes to the foreign-language classroom.

Giving and Taking Directions in Spanish
(Shared nomenclature)

Research Background

In 1964 Krauss and Weinheimer* investigated the ways in which adults communicate information when they take the roles of speakers and listeners. Pairs of visually separated college students cooperated in a task which required them to communicate in English (their native language) about novel graphic forms. Although the speaker in each pair used distinctive names for each object, the listeners had no difficulty identifying the objects and manipulating them according to instructions.

The same set of graphic forms was used in three experiments with children in nursery schools in Princeton, New Jersey.* One of the purposes of the experiments was to illustrate the utility of a method for studying referential communication in children. Pairs of children, separated by an opaque screen, were asked to communicate with each other in performing a task. The child on one side of the screen looked at a completed task; the child on the other side of the screen had pieces of the task which were to be assembled according to instructions given to him by his partner. The results showed that, unlike adults, nursery school children were unable to converge upon a shared nomenclature for the novel form, i.e., the names they gave to the objects were not mutually intelligible. However, when adults gave instructions, these children were able to perform the tasks reasonably well.

* Krauss, R. M. and Weinheimer, S. Changes in the length of reference prases as a function of social interaction: a preliminary study." Psychom. Sci., 1964, I, 113-114.

* Glucksberg, S., Krauss, R. M., and Weisberg, R. "Referential Communication in Nursery School Children: Method and Some Preliminary Findings." Journal of Experimental Child Psychology 3, 333-342 (1966).

A similar experiment was done in 1973 by Rose, Wang, Maxwell and Corey.* The Language Communication Skills Task (LCST) was developed as a technique to study the nature of language communication among young children and to assess the effectiveness of their language communication competencies. The LCST was administered to a pair of children at a time, with one playing the "message prescriber" role and the other playing the "message receiver" role. The presenter's task was to tell the receiver what object to pick up and where it was to be placed. Results showed that the young child's ability to use verbal skills (language) in a functional setting is not significantly affected by his or her linguistic competency.

Protocol Episode

Student A of each pair tries to describe in Spanish the exact position of each object in the picture. Student B, on the other side of the blind, places the objects on the flannel board as he or she listens to Student A's description: Both students may ask and answer questions in Spanish in order to help Student B complete the picture. In performing this task each student demonstrates his or her ability to give a name (nomenclature) to the object and communicate directions to his/her partner, thus, the term "shared nomenclature." Two pairs of high school students (from third and fifth year) and a pair of native speakers of Spanish completed this task.

* Rose, Suzanna, Wang, M. C., Maxwell, J., and Corey, E. "The Development of a Measure to Evaluate Language Communication Skills of Young Children." University of Pittsburg Learning Research and Development Center, 1973.

Viewer's Guide for Giving and Taking Directions in Spanish

Group I: Cite examples of paraphrasing used by each pair.

Third year	Fifth year	Native

Group II: Record examples of different words or phrases used to add precision and detail

Third year	Fifth year	Native

Group III: In the space provided, mark each time the sender or receiver speaks.

Third year	Fifth year	Native
Sender		
Totals		
Receiver		
Totals		

Group IV: Record examples of grammar errors (e.g., gender adjectival agreement, verb endings)

Third year	Fifth year

Discussion questions

1. How does each "sender" start the process of giving directions to his/her partner?

2. How is the use of directions (up, down, etc.) handled by students at the various levels?

3. What examples of paraphrasing are found? For example, what does the third-year student use for chair? What does the fifth-year student use to explain "doorknob?"

4. How does the use of adverbs vary among the three pairs shown in the film? Think in terms of which adverbs are used, the frequency with which they are used, and the function of the adverbs used.

5. Comment on the use of terms of precision in each group and how it varies from group to group. Give specific examples of the use of precision. What accounts for this variance in use of terms of precision?

6. The amount of dialog increases greatly as one moves from the third-year students to the fifth-year and finally to the native speakers. How might you explain these differences?

7. Particularly in the Spanish V students, one sees examples of interaction between the sender and the receiver. The receiver is obviously anticipating what the sender is about to say. Find examples of this interchange and anticipation. Is this a natural part of increased communicative skill? Is it desirable in a second-language class? Is it encouraged in the second-language classroom?

8. What types of errors does one hear (e.g., errors in agreement, verb forms, etc.)? What are factors that produce these errors? How many of the errors are significant in terms of communication?

9. Another possible title for this protocol episode is "shared nomenclature." Explain the significance of this title and its implication for both this protocol film and the second-language class. Think in terms of communication achieved, paraphrasing, errors, etc.

Implications for classroom use

1. How can the shared nomenclature task be adapted for classroom use (e.g., students can draw a picture based on teacher or student directions and compare their picture with the original)?

2. Could this task be used for small-group testing? Why or why not?

3. What other groups of vocabulary words or grammar structures lend themselves to similar tasks (e.g., clothing, parts of the body, rooms of the house)?

4. The protocol tapes showed many examples of student paraphrases. How can teachers help students develop the ability to paraphrase? (e.g., have students come up with variations of a sentence or series of sentences)?

5. When completing a shared nomenclature task, to what extent should teachers correct student errors? Is there a danger of overcorrection? Undercorrection?

INSTRUCTOR'S GUIDE

GIVING AND TAKING DIRECTIONS IN FRENCH

The Development of Protocols to Help Teachers Understand and Interpret the Acquisition of a Foreign Language Among Secondary School Students

Director: Edward D. Allen, Professor, The Ohio State University

Associate Director: Diane W. Birckbichler, Assistant Professor, The Ohio State University

Consultant Editor: C. Allen Honeycutt, Assistant Professor, University of Northern Iowa

Developed in the College of Education, The Ohio State University, through a grant from the International Research and Studies (CFDA No. 84.0170) Title VI, Section 605, of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Instructor's Guides

The purpose of the instructor's guide is to provide instructors with pertinent background related to each protocol episode and to provide instructional materials to be used in conjunction with the protocol videotapes. The guides consist of separate sections to accompany each episode. Instructors may choose to use any or all of the sections outlined below:

1. Background An introduction to the concept being observed and research related to the protocol episode is presented in this section. Instructors may choose to present this material orally to the students or allow them to read the information before viewing the videotape.
2. Description The protocol episode will be presented (e.g., a description of the task, information about the level of the students and participants, and other information related to the protocol).
3. Viewer's Guides These worksheets have been designed with a dual purpose: 1) to provide a focus to guide the viewer in identifying salient aspects of the concept under consideration on the protocol tapes and 2) to provide a basis for group discussions of the protocol episodes. In those cases where there are multiple worksheets, instructors may want to have different groups complete the various tasks during a single showing of the protocol tape. The different groups would then share their results with the whole group. Another alternative would be to show the tape several times and have each viewer complete each worksheet.
4. Implications for the Classroom Teacher. This section provides a series of questions and activities that allow viewers to apply the concepts illustrated in the protocol tapes to the foreign-language classroom.

Giving and Taking Directions in French
(Shared nomenclature)

Research Background

In 1964 Krauss and Weinheimer* investigated the ways in which adults communicate information when they take the roles of speakers and listeners. Paris of visually separated college students cooperated in a task which required them to communicate in English (their native language) about novel graphic forms. Although the speaker in each pair used distinctive names for each object, the listeners had no difficulty identifying the objects and manipulating them according to instructions.

The same set of graphic forms was used in three experiments with children in nursery schools in Princeton, New Jersey.* One of the purposes of the experiments was to illustrate the utility of a method for studying referential communication in children. Pairs of children, separated by an opaque screen, were asked to communicate with each other in performing a task. The child on one side of the screen looked at a completed task; the child on the other side of the screen had pieces of the task which were to be assembled according to instructions given to him by his partner. The results showed that, unlike adults, nursery school children were unable to converge upon a shared nomenclature for the novel form, i.e., the names they gave to the objects were not mutually intelligible. However, when adults gave instructions, these children were able to perform the tasks reasonably well.

* Krauss, R. M. and Weinheimer, S. Changes in the length of reference prases as a function of social interaction: a preliminary study." Psychom. Sci., 1964, I, 113-114.

* Glucksberg, S., Krauss, R. M., and Weisberg, R. "Referential Communication in Nursery School Children: Method and Some Preliminary Findings." Journal of Experimental Child Psychology 3, 333-342 (1966).

A similar experiment was done in 1973 by Rose, Wang, Maxwell and Corey.* The Language Communication Skills Task (LCST) was developed as a technique to study the nature of language communication among young children and to assess the effectiveness of their language communication co,petencies. The LCST was administered to a pair of children at a time, with one playing the "message prescriber" role and the other playing the "message receiver" role. The presenter's task was to tell the receiver what object to pick up and where it was to be placed. Results showed that the young child's ability to use verbal skills (language) in a functional setting is not significantly affected by his or her linguistic competency.

Protocol Episode

Student A of each pair tries to describe in French the exact position of each object in the picture. Student B, on the other side of the blind, places the objects on the flannel board as he or she listens to Student A's description. Both students may ask and answer questions in French in order to help Student B complete the picture. In performing this task each student demonstrates his or her ability to give a name (nomenclature) to the geometric form and communicate directions to his/her partner, thus, the term "shared nomenclature." Three pairs of (2nd, 3rd, and 4th year) high school students and a pair of native speakers of French completed this task.

Viewer's Guide for Giving and Taking Directions in French

Group I: Cite examples of paraphrasing used by each pair.

Second year	Third year	Fourth year	Native

Group II: Record examples of different words or phrases used to add precision and detail

Second year	Third year	Fourth year	Native

Group III: In the space provided, mark each time the sender or receiver speaks.

Second year	Third year	Fourth year	Native
Sender			
Totals			
Receiver			
Totals			

Group IV: Record examples of grammar errors (e.g., gender adjectival agreement, verb endings)

Second year	Third year	Fourth year	Native

Discussion Questions

1. How does each "sender" start the process of giving directions to his/her partner?

2. How is the use of directions (up, down, etc.) handled by the students at the various levels?

3. What examples of paraphrasing are found? For example, what does the fourth-year student say to explain "doorknob"?

4. How does the use of adverbs vary among the three pairs shown in the film. Think in terms of which adverbs are used, the frequency with why they are used, and the function of the adverbs used?

5. Comment on the use of terms of precision in each group and how it varies from group to group. Given specific examples of the use of precision. What accounts for this variance in use of terms of precision?

6. The amount of dialog increases as one moves from level to level and finally to the native speakers. How might you explain these differences?

7. Particularly in the French IV students, one sees examples of interaction between the sender and the receiver. The receiver is obviously anticipating what the sender is about to say. Find examples of this interchange and anticipation. Is this a natural part of increased communicative skill? Is it desirable in a second-language class? Is it encouraged in the second-language classroom?

8. What types of errors does one hear (e.g., errors in agreement, verb forms). What are factors that produce these errors? How many of the errors are significant in terms of communication?

9. Another possible title for this protocol episode is "shared nomenclature." Explain the significance of this title and its implications for both this protocol film and the second-language class. Think in terms of communication achieved, paraphrasing, errors, etc.

Implications for classroom use

1. How can the shared nomenclature task be adapted for classroom use (e.g., students can draw a picture based on teacher or student directions and compare their picture with the original)?

2. Could this task be used for small-group testing? Why or why not?

3. What other groups of vocabulary words or grammar structures lend themselves to similar tasks (e.g., clothing, parts of the body, rooms of the house)?

4. The protocol tapes showed many examples of student paraphrases. How can teachers help students develop the ability to paraphrase? (e.g., have students come up with variations of a sentence or series of sentences)?

5. When completing a shared nomenclature task, to what extent should teachers correct student errors? Is there a danger of overcorrection? Undercorrection?

RESEARCH PROJECT TO DEVELOP SPECIALIZED TEACHING MATERIALS

Title:
The Development of Protocols to help Teachers Understand and Interpret the Acquistition of a Foreign Language Among Secondary School Students.

Director:
Edward D. Allen, Professor of Foreign Language Education, The Ohio State University

Associate Director:
Diane W. Birckbichler, Assistant Professor of Foreign Language Education, The Ohio State University

Consultant & Editor:
C. Allen Honeycutt, Assistant Professor, University of Northern Iowa.

Federal Grantor Agency: International Research & Studies -- (CFDA No. 84.0170) Title VI, Section 605, of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

List of Videotapes*

1. Giving & Taking Directions in Spanish.
Three pairs of high school students perform this task:--two from second-year Spanish, two from third, and two from fifth. Each pair sits at a table with a blind between them so that they cannot see each other. On one side of the blind is a picture; on the other side are the pieces of the picture. Student A tries to describe the picture in Spanish. Student B places the pieces of the picture on the blind (flannel board) as he listens to Student A's description. Two native speakers also complete this task.

2. Giving & Taking Directions in French.
(Same format as #1.)

3. Interviewing a native speaker of Spanish.
Four high school students separately interview native Mexicans who do not speak English. The students are in their second, third, fourth, and fifth year of Spanish respectively. Each student is asked to obtain as much information as possible from the native speaker he or she is interviewing.

4. French Pronunciation.
High school students of French, from different levels of instruction, complete the following tasks: they read a short passage in French, pronounce a series of nonsense words containing French sound-symbol components, and repeat two series of French sentences, one varying in lengths and the other in complexity.

5. Story Retelling in Spanish.
Three groups of three high school students from third, fourth and fifth year Spanish classes listen to a native speaker of Spanish as he reads a Spanish version of Snow White. Each group then relates in Spanish as much of the story as they can remember.

6. Reading for Meaning in French. Use of Cloze Tests
Three high school students of French, one from second, one from third, and one from fourth year have finished circling their answers to a multiple item cloze test. Their French teacher then interviews them to discover their reasons for each choice.

7. Sentence Combining in French
Three groups of high school students from second, third and fourth year classes attempt to combine orally a series of French sentences in as many ways as they can. A native speaker also completes this task.

* Available on loan beginning October 1983. Write to Dr. Paul Peloquin, Teacher Education Laboratory, 29 W. Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210. Cost: postage only.

INSTRUCTOR'S GUIDE

INTERVIEWING A NATIVE SPEAKER OF SPANISH

The Development of Protocols to Help Teachers Understand and Interpret the Acquisition of a Foreign Language Among Secondary School Students

Director: Edward D. Allen, Professor, The Ohio State University

Associate Director: Diane W. Birckbichler, Assistant Professor, The Ohio State University

Consultant Editor: C. Allen Honeycutt, Assistant Professor, University of Northern Iowa

Developed in the College of Education, The Ohio State University, through a grant from the International Research and Studies (CFDA No. 84.0170) Title VI, Section 605, of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Instructor's Guides

The purpose of the instructor's guide is to provide instructors with pertinent background related to each protocol episode and to provide instructional materials to be used in conjunction with the protocol videotapes. The guides consist of separate sections to accompany each episode. Instructors may choose to use any or all of the sections outlined below:

*1. Background An introduction to the concept being observed and research related to the protocol episode is presented in this section. Instructors may choose to present this material orally to the students or allow them to read the information before viewing the videotape.

2. Description The protocol episode will be presented (e.g., a description of the task, information about the level of the students and participants, and other information related to the protocol).

3. Viewer's Guides These worksheets have been designed with a dual purpose: 1) to provide a focus to guide the viewer in identifying salient aspects of the concept under consideration on the protocol tapes and 2) to provide a basis for group discussions of the protocol episodes. In those cases where there are multiple worksheets, instructors may want to have different groups complete the various tasks during a single showing of the protocol tape. The different groups would then share their results with the whole group. Another alternative would be to show the tape several times and have each viewer complete each worksheet.

4. Implications for the Classroom Teacher. This section provides a series of questions and activities that allow viewers to apply the concepts illustrated in the protocol tapes to the foreign-language classroom.

Interviewing a Native Speaker of Spanish

Research background

Research in the area of communicative competence in the second-language learning situation has generally taken two forms: 1) the analysis of types of practice and their effect on the student's ability to communicate, and 2) the analysis of the student's oral or written performance in order to categorize and analyze the types of errors made by students.

Several important studies have focused on the "practice" variable, which Ausubel* identifies as one of the principal factors influencing cognitive structure. According to Ausubel one of the most important and immediate effects of practice is to increase the stability and clarity of new meanings and thus make them more resistant to forgetting.

Basing his experiment on the psychological distinction between the generic meaning of a word and its referential meaning, Jarvis* compared the effects of two types of language practice: "drill" involving the conceptual category of a word and "contextual" in which a particularized exemplar of the word is used. The experiment yielded significant results in speaking and writing skills in favor of the contextual group but no differences between the groups on tests of reading and listening skills.

* David P. Ausubel. Educational Psychology: A Cognitive View. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

* Gilbert A. Jarvis. A Comparison of Contextualized Practice with Particularized Referents Versus Practice with Generic Meaning in the Teaching of Beginning College French. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Purdue University, 1970.

Savignon* and Joiner* compared the effects of communicative and non-communicative language practice. Savignon conducted a semester-long experiment using three groups of beginning French students. Each group met for the regularly scheduled class four days a week; an additional fifth hour was spent engaging in different types of language practice. One group worked in the laboratory with basic course materials during the fifth day. A second group saw films and had experience with various aspects of French Culture; a third group engaged in communicative language activities. Savignon found that the communicative group performed significantly better on communication tests constructed by the experimenter but that there were no significant differences among the three groups on course examination, in course grades, and on standardized tests of linguistic competence.

Joiner conducted research comparing the effects of two treatments: communicative versus noncommunicative language practice. The results of this semester-long experiment indicated that the group engaging in communicative language practice, i.e., the transmission of new information during language practice, performed significantly better on tests of oral skills but not on attitudinal measures or tests of reading or writing.

In addition to seeing the relationships between types of practice and achievement, researchers also began to examine and analyze student performance

* Sandra J. Savignon. Communicative Competence: An Experiment in Foreign Language Teaching. Philadelphia, PA: The Center for Curriculum Development, 1972.

* Elizabeth G. Joiner. Communicative versus Non-Communicative Language Practice in the Teaching of Beginning College French. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1974.

and errors. Research conducted by Powell* illustrates error analysis research in the second-language learning situation. Powell investigated how well secondary-school students of French could communicate with a native speaker. Two-hundred twenty-three volunteers in fourteen secondary schools were interviewed by Powell, who posed as a native speaker of French. The students, who were in second-year French classes, were given questions in English to guide them in their interviews in French. Although the major focus of her study was on the number of correct grammatical structures that the students produced, it was observed that students were able to communicate effectively in French even with a rudimentary knowledge of the language. The interviews were recorded on audio-tape.

Protocol Episode

Four high-school students interview separately native Mexicans who do not speak English. The students are in their second, third, fourth, and fifth year of Spanish respectively. Each student is asked to obtain as much information as possible from the native speaker being interviewed; the student is then asked to report in English what he learned about the native speaker from the interview.

* Patricia B. Powell. An Investigation of Selected Syntactical and Morphological Structures in the Conversation of Secondary Students after Two Years' Study of French. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1973.

Viewer's Guide for Interviewing a Native Speaker of Spanish: Group I

Interview Information obtained

In the space provided, jot down the bits of information obtained by the student from the native speaker (e.g., name, age, favorite sport, television viewing preferences, etc.) Then check those items recalled by the student during the "remembering phase" of the protocol episode.

2nd-Year Student	3rd-Year Student	4th-Year Student	5th-Year Student

Discussion Questions

1. Which student obtained the greatest amount of information? Did this seem to be entirely a question of ability in the language or were there personality differences (e.g., curiosity and enthusiasm) that might explain this difference?
2. Which student was most accurate in remembering the information obtained during the interview? How might you explain these results?
3. What generalizations might one make about the topics of conversation chosen by the students? Did they tend to reflect student interests and/or the types of vocabulary generally introduced in high school textbooks?

Viewer's Guide for Interviewing a Native Speaker of Spanish: Group II

Discourse analysis reveals that there are a variety of ways to keep a conversation going. One of these is to ask questions related to the topic of conversation; another is to volunteer information about oneself in response to another's comments or statements. In the space provided, jot down instances where the student interviewer gives information about himself or asks questions related to the topic of conversation (e.g., if the native speaker indicates an interest in sports, the student asks what kind of sports).

2nd-Year Student	3rd-Year Student	4th-Year Student	5th-Year Student

Discussion Questions

1. Which student showed a greater facility in asking related questions?
2. Which student provided more information about himself? Does this seem to be a developmental factor or related to the student's personality?
3. Did any particular topic seem to facilitate the student's ability to keep the conversation going?

Viewer's Guide for Interviewing a Native Speaker of Spanish: Group III

Global rating scales of communicative ability are commonly used in classroom testing of the student's communicative ability. Study the following rating scale and then listen to the various interviewers. After the conversation is complete, use the scale to give an overall rating to each student's performance in each of the areas indicated. Then use the information you recorded on your rating scale for each student to answer the questions on the next page.

Excellent = 4
Good = 3
Fair = 2
Poor = 1

	2nd-Year Student	3rd-Year Student	4th-Year Student	5th-Year Student
1. Use of a wide and appropriate range of vocabulary and idomatic expressions				
2. Use of appropriate grammar and structures,				
3. Use of correct pronunciation, intonation, and stress				
4. Use of paraphrase to get a point across or to rephrase an ambiguous question or statement				
5. Ability to ask questions related to a particular topic				
6. Use of gestures and other nonverbal clues to enhance communication				
7. General rating of overall fluency				
TOTAL				

Viewer's Guide for Interviewing a Native Speaker of Spanish: Group III

Discussion Questions

1. Which student showed the widest and most appropriate range of vocabulary?
2. Which students showed the most appropriate use of grammar, structures, and idiomatic expressions?
3. Which student used the most correct pronunciation, intonation, and stress?
4. Did the ability to paraphrase vary across the different levels? Why?
5. Did the ability to ask related questions increase with greater experience in and exposure to French?
6. Did you notice a difference in the use of gestures and other nonverbal cues among the students?
7. Which student was the most accurate in remembering the information from the interview?
8. Which student seemed to exhibit the most fluent Spanish?
9. Were there other areas of consideration that seemed to have an effect on the student's ability to communicate with the native speaker? (e.g., the native speaker, the student's personality)
10. Compare your ratings of the students with the ratings of others. How similar (or dissimilar) were your ratings?

Implications for the classroom teacher

1. How can students begin to develop skills in asking related questions?

2. What techniques might be used to develop the conversational skills of students?

3. What are the advantages of using a native speaker in a task such as this? What could teachers do if native speakers are not available? Consider possibilities such as conversation pairs, using students from more advanced levels as conversation partners.

4. Assume that you have asked a native speaker to come to your class. How might students be prepared for these interviews? Does the native speaker need to be prepared? What guidelines, if any, would you give the native speaker?

5. What can the teacher or evaluator do to minimize the subjectivity of global evaluations?

6. This task required students to ask questions in an informal interview situation. Do students get enough practice asking questions in the foreign language classroom? How can teachers encourage students to ask questions as well as answer them?

INSTRUCTOR'S GUIDE

FRENCH PRONUNCIATION

The Development of Protocols to Help Teachers Understand and Interpret the Acquisition of a Foreign Language Among Secondary School Students

Director: Edward D. Allen, Professor, The Ohio State University

Associate Director: Diane W. Birckbichler, Assistant Professor, The Ohio State University

Consultant Editor: C. Allen Honeycutt, Assistant Professor, University of Northern Iowa

Developed in the College of Education, The Ohio State University, through a grant from the International Research and Studies (CFDA No. 84.0170) Title VI, Section 605, of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Instructor's Guides

The purpose of the instructor's guide is to provide instructors with pertinent background related to each protocol episode and to provide instructional materials to be used in conjunction with the protocol videotapes. The guides consist of separate sections to accompany each episode. Instructors may choose to use any or all of the sections outlined below:

1. Background An introduction to the concept being observed and research related to the protocol episode is presented in this section. Instructors may choose to present this material orally to the students or allow them to read the information before viewing the videotape.
2. Description The protocol episode will be presented (e.g., a description of the task, information about the level of the students and participants, and other information related to the protocol).
3. Viewer's Guides These worksheets have been designed with a dual purpose: 1) to provide a focus to guide the viewer in identifying salient aspects of the concept under consideration on the protocol tapes and 2) to provide a basis for group discussions of the protocol episodes. In those cases where there are multiple worksheets, instructors may want to have different groups complete the various tasks during a single showing of the protocol tape. The different groups would then share their results with the whole group. Another alternative would be to show the tape several times and have each viewer complete each worksheet.
4. Implications for the Classroom Teacher. This section provides a series of questions and activities that allow viewers to apply the concepts illustrated in the protocol tapes to the foreign-language classroom.

French Pronunciation

Research Background

In attempting to find out how well children are able to imitate oral language, Slobin and Welsh* elicited 1000 utterances from a child who was asked to repeat sentences spoken by an adult model. The child's speech revealed the following phenomena: a. omission of articles, e.g. model: "The little boy is eating some pink ice cream." Child: "Little boy eating some pink ice cream." b. omission of copula, e.g. model: "Where is kitty?" Child: "Where kitty?" c. omission of embedded clauses, e.g. model: "Mozart who cried came to my party." Child: "Mozart came to my party." d. repetition of repeated words only when the item was of lexical importance, e.g. model: "I can can can eat." Child: "I can eat." Model: "I need the ball ball." Child: "I need the ball ball."

It was clear from the research that the child attended primarily to meaning. The syntactic structures are learned intuitively at later stages.

In an experiment at the Center for Cognitive Studies, Harvard University, Mehler and Carey* asked students to write down a group of short sentences that they heard. Ten sentences in each group contained the same surface structure, but the eleventh did not. The recordings were mixed with noise. One of the important findings was that the subjects attended much more to the syntax than the actual sounds of the recording. When subjects made errors they often selected words more compatible with the syntactic

* Dan I. Slobin and Charles A. Welsh, "Elicited Imitation as a Research Tool in Developmental Psycholinguistics," Studies of Child Language Development, Charles A. Ferguson and Dan Isaac Slobin, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

* Jacques Mehler and Peter Carey, "Role of Surface and Base Sructure in the Perception of Sentences," Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 6, 335-338 (1967).

set than words that were phonetically close to the stimulus.

In 1975 Walz* conducted a longitudinal study of the pronunciation of students renrolled in first-semester French at Indiana University. Test data were collected on four occasions by four different elicitation procedures: mimicry, reading aloud, grammatical transformation exercises, and picture-cueing. The sounds produced were found to be extremely varied and only partially predictable. One of the important findings was the discovery of factors unrelated to first-language interference.

Protocol Episode

High school students of French from different levels of instruction completed the following tasks: reading aloud of a short passage in French; pronunciation of a list of nonsense words containing French sound-symbol components; repetition of a series of sentences that vary in length; and repetition of a series of sentences that vary in complexity.

* Walz, Joel Chandler. A Longitudinal Study of the Acquisition of French Pronunciation. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation; Indiana University, 1975.

Viewer's Guide for French Pronunciation: Reading Aloud

As the student reads the passage below, place a check mark in the appropriate column for each underlined word that the student pronounces correctly. When the student has finished, use the following scale to assign an overall rating to the reading of the passage.

5= sounded like a native speaker, fluent reading of the passage, no errors
4= one or two errors, few pauses
3= reading marked by occasional errors and pauses
2= frequent errors and pauses
1= intelligible but words and phonemes mispronounced
0= unintelligible

Depuis quelque temps, on s'intéresse aux différences entre le langage humain et le langage des animaux. Il y a plusieurs singes et quelques gorilles qui ont réussi à "parler." Parmi eux, Koko est la plus célèbre. Mais si vous voulez parler avec elle, il faudra que vous parliez avec vos mains, car Koko utilise le langage des sourds pour communiquer avec les humains.

2nd	5th

Discussion questions

1. What differences can be noted among the different students in terms of total number of words correct and your overall rating of their reading of the passage?

2. To what do you attribute these differences? Increased knowledge of sound-symbol correspondance? Greater knowledge of grammar? Increased vocabulary?

3. How did the students' oral reading of the passage differ from the words printed in the text? To what do you attribute these differences (e.g., interference from words that look alike?) Would the differences impede comprehension of the passage?

Viewer's Guide for French Phonology: Pronunciation of nonsense words

As the student from each grade level reads the list of nonsense words, check each word that the student pronounces correctly. The entire word must be pronounced correctly for the student to receive credit.

Nonsense words.	3rd	4th	5th
1. boux			
2. zont			
3. dein			
4. feat			
5. gu			
6. chelle			
7. gonne			
8. leaux			
9. dien			
10. gué			
11. seune			
12. tez			
13. quine			
14. teu			
15. meuil			
16. pitoux			
17. soubrue			
18. vauruche			
19. dibouille			
20. duivaux			
21. houlure			
22. dufeuil			
23. viseaunot			
24. quileurpon			
25. saibonner			
26. majeuneur			
27. roubatille			
28. laindipoumoeuf			
29. masuelisant			
30. fundiqualure			
Total correct	_____	_____	_____

Viewer's Guide for French Pronunciation: Reading Aloud

Discussion Questions

1. Why were real French words not used in this protocol episode?

2. Which student showed a greater knowledge of sound-symbol correspondence?

3. Compare and contrast those sounds that students experienced the most difficulty pronouncing. Are there certain sounds that are more problematic than others?

4. What types of remedial practice would be suggested for these problem sounds?

Viewer's Guide for Pronunciation: Sentence Repetition -- Length

Each time a student repeats a sentence correctly, place a check mark in the appropriate column. In this case, the repetition of the complete sentence regardless of pronunciation errors indicates satisfactory completion of the task.

	2nd	4th	5th
1. Jacques va à l'école. Comments:			
2. Marie est contente. Comments:			
3. Mon père ne parle pas français. Comments:			
4. Je vais au cinéma ce soir. Comments:			
5. Christine et moi nous allons au théâtre. Comments:			
6. Est-ce que vous mangez souvent de la viande? Comments:			
7. Je ne sais pas pourquoi Marc ne fait pas ses devoirs. Comments:			
8. Paul a décidé d'aller acheter des pommes de terre, du fromage et des fruits. Comments:			
Total correct	_____	_____	_____

Viewer's Guide for French Pronunciation: Sentence Repetition - Length

Discussion Questions

1. Compare and contrast the performance of the three students. Which student was the most successful? The least successful? To what do you attribute these differences?

2. Why did the students have difficulty remembering the longer sentences? What would have helped their ability to repeat these sentences? A second repetition? Breaking the sentences down?

3. Do you think that students might have been able to repeat the sentences if they had been related to a theme or situation?

Sentence Repetition: complexity

Each time a student repeats a sentence correctly, place a check mark in the appropriate column. In this case, the repetition of the complete sentence regardless of pronunciation errors indicates satisfactory completion of the task.

	2nd	3rd	5th
1. Jacques est un garçon intelligent. Comments:			
2. Marie a parlé anglais avec Paul. Comments:			
3. Est-ce que vous avez lu le journal? Comments:			
4. Ne fais pas cet exercice de mathématiques. Comments:			
5. Nous ferons un pique-nique dimanche prochain. Comments:			
6. Marc vient d'acheter une voiture. Comments:			
7. Mes amis faisaient souvent la cuisine. Comments:			
8. Ils étaient allés au théâtre avec leurs amis. Comments:			
9. Votre mère, vous a-t-elle donné de l'argent? Comments:			
10. Il faut que nous fassions le devoir pour demain. Comments:			
11. Vous devez essayer de parler plus lentement. Comments:			
12. Nous avions voulu rentrer à la maison avant midi. Comments:			
13. Ils auraient dû faire ce qu'on leur avait demandé. Comments:			
14. Si j'avais su de quoi il s'agissait, je ne serais pas venu. Comments:			
Total Correct	_____	_____	_____

Viewer's Guide for French Pronunciation: Sentence Repetition - Complexity

Discussion Questions

1. Which student was the most successful in repeating these sentences? The least successful? To what do you attribute these differences?

2. In certain cases, students repeated the entire sentence but made an error or several errors. What types of mistakes did they tend to make? Errors in syntax? Errors in meaning?

3. What types of strategies did students use when they could not immediately remember a sentence?

4. In your opinion, why did students have difficulty repeating the last three sentences?

5. In general, what determines the complexity of a sentence (e.g., verb tense, length, familiarity with vocabulary)?

French Pronunciation

Implications for the classroom teacher

1. What is the place of reading aloud in the foreign language classroom? What skill(s) are actually measured when students read a passage aloud? How does reading aloud differ from silent reading?

2. How could the list of nonsense words be used in the classroom to diagnose student problems with sound-symbol correspondence? Could real but new words also be used? Why or why not?

3. What types of activities might be used to help students learn to handle sentences of increasing length and complexity? For instance a memory game might ask students to repeat a sentence and then add other items (e.g., Je vais au marché et je vais acheter des pommes. Moi, je vais au marché et je vais acheter des pommes et des poires, etc.).

4. When should a teacher correct student pronunciation errors? Would you correct pronunciation errors during conversational practice? During grammar drills? What are the dangers of overcorrection? Undercorrection?

INSTRUCTOR'S GUIDE

STORY RETELLING IN SPANISH

The Development of Protocols to Help Teachers Understand and Interpret the Acquisition of a Foreign Language Among Secondary School Students

Director: Edward D. Allen, Professor, The Ohio State University

Associate Director: Diane W. Birckbichler, Assistant Professor, The Ohio State University

Consultant Editor: C. Allen Honeycutt, Assistant Professor, University of Northern Iowa

Developed in the College of Education, The Ohio State University, through a grant from the International Research and Studies (CFDA No. 84.0170) Title VI, Section 605, of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Instructor's Guides

The purpose of the instructor's guide is to provide instructors with pertinent background related to each protocol episode and to provide instructional materials to be used in conjunction with the protocol videotapes. The guides consist of separate sections to accompany each episode. Instructors may choose to use any or all of the sections outlined below:

1. Background An introduction to the concept being observed and research related to the protocol episode is presented in this section. Instructors may choose to present this material orally to the students or allow them to read the information before viewing the videotape.
2. Description The protocol episode will be presented (e.g., a description of the task, information about the level of the students and participants, and other information related to the protocol).
3. Viewer's Guides These worksheets have been designed with a dual purpose: 1) to provide a focus to guide the viewer in identifying salient aspects of the concept under consideration on the protocol tapes and 2) to provide a basis for group discussions of the protocol episodes. In those cases where there are multiple worksheets, instructors may want to have different groups complete the various tasks during a single showing of the protocol tape. The different groups would then share their results with the whole group. Another alternative would be to show the tape several times and have each viewer complete each worksheet.
4. Implications for the Classroom Teacher. This section provides a series of questions and activities that allow viewers to apply the concepts illustrated in the protocol tapes to the foreign-language classroom.

Story Retelling in Spanish

Research Background

Mandler and Johnson* conducted an experiment to ascertain the ability of children and adults to retell stories (in English, their native language). There were 21 subjects from each of the following levels: first grade, fourth grade and the university. Each subject was asked to retell two stories that he/she heard on tape. The first story was retold ten minutes after it was heard; the second story 24 hours later. The performance of the subjects was scored for the presence or abscence of each proposition (a proposition was defined as a clause or sentence that contained an action or a stative verb). The researchers examined five major components of the stories: settings, beginnings, reactions, outcomes, and endings. Results showed that the adults recalled more than the fourth graders who, in turn, recalled more than the first graders.

Children tended to organize their recall emphases on outcomes of actions rather than the actions themselves or the internal events that motivated them. Descriptive adjectives and adverbs were poorly recalled. It was also found that correct temporal ordering in a story depended on the degree of structure present in the prose and that stories have a higher degree of structure than other types of prose passages. The more a story conforms to an ideal structure, the better the recall will be.

Protocol Episode

Three groups of three high school students from third, fourth, and fifth year Spanish listen to a native speaker of Spanish as he reads a Spanish version of Snow White. Each group then relates in Spanish as much of the story that they can remember.

* Mandler, J. and Johnson, N. "Remembrance of Things Parsed: Story Structure and Recall." Cognitive Psychology, #9, 1977, 111-151.

Viewer's Guide for Story Retelling in Spanish: Group I

Below is a list of 44 events that took place in the story of Blanca Nieves y los Siete Enanitos (Snow White). Listen as each group retells the story and check the events as they recall them. Count the event correct if they get at least part of the information right. Ignore errors in vocabulary and grammar unless they really impede comprehension.

	Spanish 3	Spanish 4	Spanish 5
1. Una reina miraba la nieve.			
2. Se picó un dedo y la sangre cayó en la nieve.			
3. La reina dijo, "Deseo que mi hija tenga los labios tan rojos como la sangre y su cutis tan blanco como la nieve.			
4. Nació una niña, y la llamó Blanca Nieves.			
5. La reina murió.			
6. La nueva reina era hermosa y egoísta.			
7. Preguntó a su espejo, " Quién es la dama mas bella de aquí?"			
8. El espejo contestó, "Tú eres la más hermosa."			
9. Blanca Nieves se convirtió en una hermosa doncella.			
10. El espejo le dijo a la reina, "Blanca Nieves es más hermosa que tú."			
11. Esto enfureció a la reina.			
12. La reina le dijo a su sirviente, "Lleva a Blanca Nieves al bosque y mátala."			
13. El Sirviente no la mató.			
14. El sirviente regresó al castillo y dijo que Blanca Nieves estaba muerta.			
15. Los árboles del bosque asustaron a Blanca Nieves; parecían que trataban a agarrarla.			

	Spanish 3	Spanish 4	Spanish 5
16. Blanca Nieves encontró una casita linda en el bosque.			
17. Blanca Nieves entró en la casa y dijo, "Esta casita está muy sucia."			
18. Blanca Nieves la limpió.			
19. Subió al segundo piso, se acostó, y se durmio.			
20. Los siete enanitos regresaron a la casa.			
21. Dijeron, " Qué limpio está todo!"			
22. Subieron al segundo piso.			
23. Blanca Nieves se despertó.			
24. Los enanitos la encontraron muy hermosa.			
25. Blanca Nieves dijo, "Me Quedaré."			
26. La reina preguntó otra vez al espejo quién era la más hermosa del lugar.			
27. El espejo respondió, "Blanca Nieves."			
28. La reina se disfrazó de una pobre vieja.			
29. Llevaba una manzana envenenada.			
30. Los enanitos le dijeron a Blanca Nieves, "No abras la puerta a nadie."			
31. La vieja tocó a la puerta y pidió agua.			
32. Blanca Nieves olvidó lo que los enanitos le habían advertido, abrió la puerta y le dio agua.			
33. La vieja le dió la manzana a Blanca Nieves.			
34. Blanca Nieves la comió y cayó al suelo.			
35. Los enanitos regresaron.			
36. No pudiendo despertarla, ellos le construyeron una caja de cristal.			

	Spanish 3	Spanish 4	Spanish 5
37. Un día un príncipe cruzaba el bosque en su caballo blanco.			
38. Los enanitos le contaron al príncipa la historia de Blanca Nieves.			
39. El príncipe abrió la caja y besó a Blanca Nieves.			
40. Blanca Nieves abrió los ojos y sonrió.			
41. El príncipe le preguntó al enanito más viejo si pudiera casarse con ella.			
42. El enanito dijo que sí.			
43. Los enanitos gritaron "¡Viva!"			
44. El príncipe y Blanca Nieves se fueron en el caballo blanco y fueron muy felices para siempre.			

1. Which group recalled the most details? The least? What factors do you think account for these differences (e.g., memory, knowledge of vocabulary, command of grammar)?

2. Decide which events in the story are the most important (i.e., contribute to the unfolding of the plot) and the least important. Then compare and contrast the reporting of these events by the different levels of students.

3. Which group seemed to be the most cohesive and cooperative? Did this have any bearing on their story retelling?

Viewer's Guide for Story Retelling in Spanish: Group II

As the students retell the story, jot down the ways in which the group expresses the ideas listed below.

	Spanish 3	Spanish 4	Spanish 5
1. In English we say, "Once upon a time." What do they say at the beginning of this story?			
2. How do they describe the future princess?			
3. What word do they use for "born"?			
4. How do they describe the new queen?			
5. How do they express the beauty of the grown-up princess?			
6. How do they describe the mirror?			
7. How do they describe the trees that frightened Snow White?			
8. How do they say "Snow White found a little house"?			

Viewer's Guide for Story Retelling in Spanish: Group II (continued)

	Spanish 3	Spanish 4	Spanish 5
9. How do they say, "The queen dressed like an old woman"?			
10. How do they say, "the poisoned apple"?			
11. How do they say, "She forgot the dwarfs' warning"?			
12. How do they say, "in exchange for" in the sentence, "The old woman gave Snow White an apple in exchange for the water"?			
13. How do they say, "They lived happily ever after"?			

Discussion Questions

1. What knowledge do the students bring to bear on the retelling of the story that stem 1) from their previous knowledge of the story in English or the Walt Disney film or 2) from interference from English in word-for-word translations? What effect might this prior knowledge have on their ability to retell the story?

2. What do you think some of the problems might be if foreign language students listened and tried to retell an unfamiliar story?

3. Which group imitated more closely the Spanish text (e.g., use of literary terms and transitional devices)? Cite specific examples.

Implications for the classroom teacher

1. How might this story-telling technique be used in the language classroom? Could it allow students to practice their communicative skills? Could it be used for testing listening comprehension? How?

2. This videotape shows high school students retelling aloud the story. Could this also be a writing activity (e.g., read the story aloud and have students retell in writing the story)? Why or why not?

3. As you noticed, the students at all levels made grammatical errors while retelling the story. How should teachers treat these errors? Should they ignore errors that do not impede communication? Should they correct these errors? Should they look for general areas in which students are experiencing difficulty (e.g., use of the imperfect, adjectival agreement) and do subsequent review exercises?

4. In the protocol episode, the students were familiar with the story of "Snow White" and the sequence of events in that story. When dealing with an unfamiliar story, what types of activities could the teacher use to prepare the students for the passage? Use of an overview? Preteaching of vocabulary? Preteaching or review of grammar structures?

5. Assume that you have read aloud the story of "Snow White" to your students and that they have retold the story. What other activities could be done to involve the students in using the vocabulary, story line, and/or grammar for communication? A discussion of jealousy between parents and children? Role playing of the story? Personal reaction to the story? Changing the ending of the story?

INSTRUCTOR'S GUIDE

READING FOR MEANING IN FRENCH: USE OF CLOZE TESTS

The Development of Protocols to Help Teachers Understand and Interpret the Acquisition of a Foreign Language Among Secondary School Students

Director: Edward D. Allen, Professor, The Ohio State University

Associate Director: Diane W. Birckbichler, Assistant Professor, The Ohio State University

Consultant Editor: C. Allen Honeycutt, Assistant Professor, University of Northern Iowa

Developed in the College of Education, The Ohio State University, through a grant from the International Research and Studies (CFDA No. 84.-170) Title VI, Section 605, of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Instructor's Guides

The purpose of the instructor's guide is to provide instructors with pertinent background related to each protocol episode and to provide instructional materials to be used in conjunction with the protocol videotapes. The guides consist of separate sections to accompany each episode. Instructors may choose to use any or all of the sections outlined below:

*1. Background An introduction to the concept being observed and research related to the protocol episode is presented in this section. Instructors may choose to present this material orally to the students or allow them to read the information before viewing the videotape.

2. Description The protocol episode will be presented (e.g., a description of the task, information about the level of the students and participants, and other information related to the protocol).

3. Viewer's Guides These worksheets have been designed with a dual purpose: 1) to provide a focus to guide the viewer in identifying salient aspects of the concept under consideration on the protocol tapes and 2) to provide a basis for group discussions of the protocol episodes. In those cases where there are multiple worksheets, instructors may want to have different groups complete the various tasks during a single showing of the protocol tape. The different groups would then share their results with the whole group. Another alternative would be to show the tape several times and have each viewer complete each worksheet.

4. Implications for the Classroom Teacher. This section provides a series of questions and activities that allow viewers to apply the concepts illustrated in the protocol tapes to the foreign-language classroom.

Reading for Meaning in French: Use of Cloze Tests

Research Background

The Cloze Test, usually consisting of a passage of from 200 to 300 words in which every n'th word is deleted, has been used since its development by Wilson Taylor in 1953 primarily for determining the readability of a passage and for investigating reading comprehension. Most of the research with the cloze has been conducted in English as the native language and in English as a second language; however, some research has been conducted in other languages as second languages.

Ozete (1977) administered two modified clozes, called a reading input test, to 486 college students enrolled in the first four semesters of Spanish to assess reading comprehension at differing levels of second-language learning. The input test required the readers to select systematically between correct answers and distractors; thus the reading process was isolated from the writing process. Analysis of the results revealed that the tests effectively discriminated between students enrolled in different levels of instruction. Ozete concluded that "the cloze procedure offers a simple, objective means to assess reading comprehension."

Brière et al. (1978) investigated the following question: "Are cloze tests sensitive enough to separate the achievement scores of first, second, and third semester students taking such widely diverse foreign languages as German, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish into statistically significant levels?" When they administered 50-item cloze tests with every seventh word randomly deleted to 204 subjects in the four languages, they determined that the semester scores for each language were significantly different from each other.

Haynie (1979) administered a multiple-choice cloze test to 65 second-year and 45 third-year high-school students of French to see if the cloze was able to discriminate between at least two levels of high-school students of French. With the multiple-choice format, Haynie hoped to eliminate some of the major problems of the regular cloze that appear to be difficult and frustrating for students in their early years of foreign-language study. With the regular cloze, readers might be able to read and understand the material but have difficulty supplying the deleted word. In Haynie's cloze test, the original words of the text were kept, and distractors were added at every sixth word. One of the distractors was syntactically but not semantically correct; the other distractors were inappropriate syntactically and semantically. After the administration and correction of the written test, Haynie interviewed some of the better and poorer students to determine how the subjects arrived at the answers they had selected. From the analysis of the results, Haynie concluded that the multiple-choice cloze was capable of distinguishing second-year high-school students of French from third-year students.

* Ozete, Oscar. "The Cloze Test Procedure: A Modification." Foreign Language Annals, 10 (October, 1977): 565-68.

* Briere, Eugene et al. "A Look at Cloze Testing Across Language and Levels." Modern Language Journal, 60 (January-February, 1978): 23-6.

* Haynie, Richard. A Study of the Multiple-Choice Test as a Measure of Reading Comprehension in French. Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1979.

Haynie based his interview techniques on research conducted by Hosenfeld* who was interested in learning strategies employed by second-language learners. While enrolled in a beginning college Spanish course, Hosenfeld noted that she and other students in the class were able to describe the ways in which they learned Spanish. She subsequently found, through interviews using an introspective technique called "thinking aloud" that junior-high school students could also describe their language learning strategies. 30 ninth-grade students were randomly selected from three Level-Two French classes. Because a majority of class time was spent completing exercises in a basic French text, she randomly selected 50% of the exercises in chapters four through eight of this text and interviewed students as they completed grammar exercises. The 30 20-minute interviews were recorded on tape. The results of this study indicated that while a few students consistently processed the meaning of the words in the grammar exercises, the majority of students attended only to the information needed to successfully complete the grammar exercise.

* Carol Hosenfeld. A Learning Teaching View of Second-Language Instruction: The Learning Strategies of Second Language Learners with Reading-Grammar Tasks. Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1977.

Protocol Episode

In this protocol episode, three French students--a second-year, a third-year, and a fourth-year student--were asked to complete an eighteen-item multiple-choice cloze test just prior to the filming. During the filming, the students were asked individually to think aloud and explain why they had selected a certain response to each of the items on the cloze test. A copy of this test follows.

Reading for Meaning: Use of Cloze Tests
Cloze Test Used in Protocol Episode

This is a measure of reading comprehension in French. In the passage that follows, you will find four or five words, at regular intervals, that could possibly make sense in the text. Read the passage carefully and choose the word at each interval that you feel best completes the text. Mark your answer by circling the word you have chosen. If you are not sure of a particular choice at any interval, make the best guess you can and move on.

Example: Pierre va à la
a. plage
b. commencer
c. sportif
d. cette
e. cinéma

Here, you choose "plage" because that word best completes the statement.

LES SOUVENIRS DU DIMANCHE

Le dimanche est un jour "pas comme les autres" en France, surtout quand on est enfant. C'est avant tout un (1) qu'on passe

A. travailler
B. mois
C. grand
D. jour
E. ce

A. pour
(2) B. en famille. C'est souvent le (3)
C. jouer
D. la
E. enfant

A. Français
B. même jour
C. seul
D. rester
E. mon

A. aller
libre pour le (4) B. pere , et les souvenirs que beaucoup
C. frère
D. cette
E. toujours

A. libres
(5) B. de Français gardent de leur père (6)
C. en
D. sont
E. dimanches

A. avant
B. sont
C. disent
D. enfance
E. souvent

surtout des souvenirs de dimanche.

Quels souvenirs? Demandez à un (7)

A. Francais
B. enfant ce que le mot
C. pour
D. joli
E. visiter

A. de
"dimanche" (8) B. autre rappelle; il vous racontera les
C. lui
D. se
E. raconter

A. ces
B. voir
(9) C. jours de son enfance.
D. habilles
E. dimanches

C'est (10)
A. quand
B. finir
C. bon
D. le
E. mon

jour où l'on se (11)
A. passait
B. levait
C. du
D. église
E. toujours

plus tard que les autres (12)
A. dimanches
B. vieux
C. jours de la semaine. Et où
D. promener
E. ces

(13)
A. s'amuser
B. pere
C. l'on
D. pour
E. contraste

s'habillait mieux. Les cloches de (14)
A. avec
B. regarder
C. cette
D. l'
E. française

église sonnaient, et de (15)
A. laides
B. vieilles dames habillées de noir
C. parler
D. souvenirs
E. ces

s'arrêtaient pour (16)
A. travailler
B. causer avec d'autres vieilles, leurs
C. content
D. sur
E. jour

amies. (17)
A. Français
B. Les habitants des grandes villes allaient
C. Ces
D. Beaucoup

(18)
A. pique-niquer
B. ou à la campagne.
C. jardin
D. habiter
E. seuls

Viewer's Guide for Reading for Meaning in French: Use of Cloze Tests: Group I

As the students think aloud, place a check mark by the number of each correct response that they give.

	2nd-Year French	3rd-Year French	4th-Year French	Total Correct
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				
18.				
Total Correct				

Viewer's Guide for Reading for Meaning: Use of Cloze Tests: Group I

Discussion Questions

1. Which student got the most right? What accounted for the differences?

2. Were there items that were easy for all three students? What makes these items easy?

3. Were there items that were difficult for all students? What might account for the difficulty of these items?

4. In general, what are factors that might make an item difficult or easy in an exercise such as this?

5. Which of the students seemed most at ease while thinking aloud? What cognitive, social, and personality factors might determine how comfortable a student felt or appeared?

Viewer's Guide for Reading for Meaning in French: Use of Cloze Tests: Group II

As the students think aloud, mark the appropriate category that accounts for their choice. For example, if the students indicate that they looked at a verb ending, place a tally mark in the syntactic cue column. If the students indicate that the word makes sense in the context, place a mark in the semantic cue column. The knowledge of the world category might include statements such as picnics are a typical family activity.

	2nd-Year	3rd-Year	4th-Year
1. Used syntactic cues: Comments:			
2. Used semantic cues: Comments:			
3. Used syntactic and semantic cues: Comments:			
4. Used knowledge of the world: Comments:			
5. Backtracked to confirm answers: Comments:			
6. Looked ahead to explain answer: Comments:			
7. Used translation to explain choices: Comments:			
8. Other: Comments:			

Viewer's Guide for Reading for Meaning: Use of Cloze Tests: Group II

1. Which of the three students made greater use of syntactic clues in arriving at his or her answers? What explanation can be given to explain this tendency?

2. Which level demonstrated a greater reliance on semantic clues? Why?

3. To what extent was translation used as a tool to confirm student choices? Did its use vary from level to level?

4. To what extent did students use their knowledge of the world rather than (or in addition to) syntactic and semantic clues?

5. Which student showed a greater ability to backtrack and go ahead in the text to explain his or her choices?

Implications for the classroom teacher

1. What does the cloze technique show about the reading process (use of cues)? How does the cloze work? How do students know what word to place in the blank? Why is the cloze purported to measure reading comprehension?

2. How can a foreign-language teacher prepare students for using cloze testing in the classroom (e.g. running through a sample cloze and thinking aloud for the students, etc.)?

3. Can cloze tests be integrated into the foreign-language curriculum? If so, how? What problems, if any, do you foresee (e.g. negative student reaction, etc.)?

4. Why is the cloze particularly difficult for the second-language learner? Consider command of syntax and knowledge of vocabulary, but also think about why we say Merry Christmas and Happy New Year. What prevents our saying Merry New Year?

5. What advantages do you see in using a multiple-choice cloze as opposed to a fill-in-the-blank cloze? What disadvantages are there to the multiple-choice format? Which format would have greater discrimination power? Would the decision on which format to use vary according to the level of the students and/or the purpose of the activity? If so, why and how?

6. How can the cloze be used for small-group activities? What are some of the advantages and disadvantages of having a small group of student work on a cloze-task (e.g., pooling of knowledge, explaining concepts in student terms)?

7. What can the foreign-language teacher learn from having students think aloud? For what kind of activities might this technique be used (e.g., identification of weaknesses in grammar, vocabulary, reading ability)?

INSTRUCTOR'S GUIDE

SENTENCE COMBINING IN FRENCH

The Development of Protocols to Help Teachers Understand and Interpret the Acquisition of a Foreign Language Among Secondary School Students

Director: Edward D. Allen, Professor, The Ohio State University

Associate Director: Diane W. Birckbichler, Assistant Professor, The Ohio State University

Consultant Editor: C. Allen Honeycutt, Assistant Professor, University of Northern Iowa

Developed in the College of Education, The Ohio State University, through a grant from the International Research and Studies (CFDA No. 84.0170) Title VI, Section 605, of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Instructor's Guides

The purpose of the instructor's guide is to provide instructors with pertinent background related to each protocol episode and to provide instructional materials to be used in conjunction with the protocol videotapes. The guides consist of separate sections to accompany each episode. Instructors may choose to use any or all of the sections outlined below:

1. Background An introduction to the concept being observed and research related to the protocol episode is presented in this section. Instructors may choose to present this material orally to the students or allow them to read the information before viewing the videotape.
2. Description The protocol episode will be presented (e.g., a description of the task, information about the level of the students and participants, and other information related to the protocol).
3. Viewer's Guides These worksheets have been designed with a dual purpose: 1) to provide a focus to guide the viewer in identifying salient aspects of the concept under consideration on the protocol tapes and 2) to provide a basis for group discussions of the protocol episodes. In those cases where there are multiple worksheets, instructors may want to have different groups complete the various tasks during a single showing of the protocol tape. The different groups would then share their results with the whole group. Another alternative would be to show the tape several times and have each viewer complete each worksheet.
4. Implications for the Classroom Teacher. This section provides a series of questions and activities that allow viewers to apply the concepts illustrated in the protocol tapes to the foreign-language classroom.

Sentence Combining in French

Research Background

Interest in sentence combining in the foreign language classroom has been an outgrowth of research conducted by English educators. Hunt,* for example, became interested in the construct of "syntactic maturity," which involves two general areas (grammatical complexity and variety of structures used). In an analysis of the writing of American school students, he used the "T-unit" to measure the syntactic maturity of the writing of American school children (generally defined as one main clause and any subordination attached to the main clause) The results of Hunt's research showed that the average length of T-units increased with the age of the students and that syntactic maturity grew as the students developed the ability to use embedded clauses in sentences. Cooper* and Monroe* found that the syntactic maturity of foreign language students increased from elementary to advanced levels of instruction.

In the early 70s O'Hare* conducted an experiment with seventh-grade English students to develop "syntactic maturity" in their writing. By using the process of sentence-combining in his experimental group the seventh-grade students wrote at a level of syntactic maturity beyond

* Hunt, K. W. "Grammatical Structures Written at Three Grade Levels," NCTE Research Report #3(Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

* Cooper, Thomas C. "Measuring Written Syntactic Patterns of Second Language Learners of German," Journal of Educational Research, 59, (January 1976), 176-83.

* Monroe, James. "Measuring and Enhancing Syntactic Fluency in French," French Review, 48(May, 1975), 1023-31.

that of average eight graders. In addition, a panel of experienced English teachers rated the quality of the compositions of the experimental group significantly higher than those of the control group.

Cooper, Morain, and Kalivoda* investigated sentence-combing in third-quarter German, French, and Spanish classes at the University of Georgia. The three experimental classes had regular practice in sentence-combining techniques while the three control groups spent the same amount of time doing writing exercises in their workbooks. The three writing tests involved combing kernel sentences as well as free composition. The final task also included a speaking test. The results showed that the experimental students performed better on all tests.

Protocol Episode

In the original filming of the protocol episode, a native speaker of French and three groups of students were given twenty-eight sets of two complete sentences (e.g., J'ai vu une jenue fille. Vous m'avez parlé de cette fille.) The groups were then asked to combine the two sentences in each set in as many ways as they could. In the final version of the protocol tape, the following sets of sentences were included:

1. All the sentences that the second-year students correctly combined were included.
2. For the third-year students (who correctly combined all those

* O'Hara, Frank. "Sentence-Combining: Improving Student Writing Without Formal Grammar Instruction," NCTE Research Report No. 15, (Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1973), p. 54.

* Cooper, Thomas C., Genelle Morain, and Theodore Kalivoda. Sentence Combining in Second Language Instruction. Language in Education. Theory and Practice. #31. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1980.

combined by the second-year students) only those sentences beyond those produced by the second-year students were included.

3. Only those sentences that the fifth-year students combined beyond those produced by the third-year students were included. Those sets where students generated several correct possibilities were also included.

The sentences used in the protocol episode follow.

Viewer's Guide for Sentence combining in French

Optional: Before viewing the protocol tape on sentence combining, please complete the task below. This exercise contains the same sentences that the participants in the protocol episode were asked to complete.

Make sentences from each of the following pairs of sentences.

1. Voilà le garçon. Le garçon parle français.

_____

2. Voilà les disques. Marie regarde les disques.

_____

3. Voilà le professeur. Christine aime le professeur.

_____

4. C'est une jeune fille. Elle joue au tennis.

_____

5. C'est un homme. Je déteste cet homme.

_____

6. Anne a un sac. Le sac est élégant.

_____

7. Je cherche la chemise. La chemise est à moi.

_____

8. Je vois les livres. Les livres sont à elle.

_____

9. Le chien est très beau. J'ai trouvé ce chien dans la rue.

_____

10. Il y a un chat dans le jardin. Le chat est joli et blanc.

_____

11. Mon frère gagne beaucoup d'argent. Mon frère est un médecin célèbre.

_____

12. Une femme vient à l'école. Cette femme a les cheveux blonds.

_____

13. Mon père m'a forcé à lire des histoires. Les histoires étaient ridicules.

_____

14. C'est un professeur exceptionnel. Tour les étudiants parlent de ce professeur.

_____

15. Monsieur Dupont a un fils brillant. Monsieur Dupont est fier de son fils.

_____

16. Les amis de Charles ne sont pas très intelligents. Charles étudie avec ses amis.

_____

17. La machine corrige toutes les fautes. J'ai besoin de cette machine.

_____

18. Le petit garçon part pour la France. Je pense à ce petit garçon.

_____

19. Voilà le sac. J'ai mis mes livres dans ce sac.

_____

20. Je vois les crayons. Les élèves écrivent leurs devoirs avec ces crayons.

_____

21. J'ai vu la jeune fille. Vous m'avez parlé de cette jeune fille.

_____

22. Voilà le garçon. J'ai donne de l'argent à ce garçon.

_____

23. Voilà un professeur. J'ai beaucoup d'admiration pour ce professeur.

_____

24. Georges a assisté au dernier match de football. Est-ce que Georges a aimé ce dernier match de football?

_____

25. Voilà l'école. Je vais à cette école.

_____

26. Voilà le bureau. Mon ami travaille dans ce bureau.

_____

27. Il y a des questions. Je m'intéresse à ces questions.

_____

28. Voilà des pensées. Je suis d'accord avec ces pensées.

_____

5. The native speaker experienced some difficulty and hesitancy in correctly combining some of the sets. To what do you attribute his difficulty (e.g., factors in his own personality, his knowledge of the language, his unfamiliarily with a formal sentence combing task)

6. For students in general what factors in this exercise made one set of sentences more difficult or easier than another set?

Viewer's Guide for Sentence-Combining in French

As you listen to the ways in which the students combine the sentences, place a mark after each connector or structure used.

	Native	2nd year	3rd year	5th year
qui				
que				
conjunction (e.g., mais or et)				
adjective as connector				
ou				
de				
possessive adjective (e.g., ses)				
possessive pronouns (e.g., les siens)				
passive construction				
appositive				
dont				
preposition + (lequel)				
preposition + qui				

Discussion Questions

1. What structure(s) did each group use successfully?

2. What factors account for the differing ability of the groups to use the various structures?

3. Which sets of sentences were difficult for the fifth-year students? To what do you attribute the difficulty?

4. Which group seemed to be the most relaxed and the most cohesive? To what do you attribute the differences between the groups in their ability to complete the task and in their enjoyment of the task?

Implications for the classroom teacher

1. What is the value of having students work with exercises involving sentence combining? How does the student learn from such an exercise?

2. How could an exercise such as sentence combining be changed to make it more communicative and less artifical? (e.g., Have students complete sentences such as "Je connais une personne qui ...." versus "Je connais une personne que," etc.)

3. What are the advantages and disadvantages of having small groups of students "colloborate" on grammatical exercises?

4. If students groups are used for grammatical exercises, what would be the cognitive and affective factors in selecting the composition of the different groups?

5. What type(s) of student might enjoy an exercise such as sentence combining (e.g., those who like problem, solving those "strong" in grammar)? What type(s) of student might react negatively to this task (e.g., those weak in grammar)?

6. What can teachers do to help students be more successful in an exercise involving sentence combining?

APPENDIX B

Evaluation Reports from Off-Campus Consultants

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
COLLEGE PARK 20742

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION PHONE: 301-454-2021

April 15, 1983

Dr. Edward D. Allen
Humanities Education
238 Arps Hall
Ohio State University
1945 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Ed:
Thanks for asking me to evaluate your videotape project. I have enjoyed the experience to date, and I am also delighted to report that I am learning! Who could ask for more than that?

I am forwarding herein my evaluative comments on all four of the videotapes which you have sent me to date as well as the videotapes. On the whole, you will see that I have found most things to my personal liking and very little to recommend in terms of changes, except in the area of use in the field. My assumption has been that the videotapes are complete as is and that changes were still possible in the handbook or manuals which are being developed to accompany the videotapes. Therefore, many of my suggestions deal with information which might be provided to what I call the teacher-user, who might be either a preservice or an inservice teacher. I think that aspect of the project is very important and that the potential user should be guided by those of you who have conceived the project and its products.

I am taking the liberty of including a sample copy of a handbook which I developed as part of a project in New York. My recommendation is that you develop a format similar to that one for each of your videotapes. Needless to say, you may not want to follow that approach, and I shall certainly understand if that is the case. Those videotapes and accompanying manuals have proven very useful at the preservice level both in New York and now here in Maryland. It has been my experience that preservice teachers need a great deal of direction when using materials such as mine and yours. Feel free to talk to me about this at the Northeast Conference.

I look forward to seeing you in Baltimore and before that to receiving the final materials for evaluation. My best to Virginia, Diane, and Gil!

Cordially,

Charles R. Hancock

FL Proficiency of High School Students

Giving & Understanding Directions

(Spanish)

Directions — 14 min. 15. sec.

Teacher gives them in English

- 1st group of students (Spanish III)
- 2nd group of students (Spanish V)
- 2 native speakers

Evaluative Comments

Suggestions

A. Item 4 of the user handout requests the user to "compare the performance of the high school students with that of the native speakers. Consider such items as range of vocabulary, complexity of sentences, and length of sentences."

- Another major difference was the introductory comments by the native speaker who set the scene and assigned the task, clarifying whose left, right, etc., which, incidentally, was not shown/done in either of the two non-native speaker scenes.

QUESTION: What impact does the presence/absence of an overview statement or purpose statement have on participant performance?

QUESTION: What aspects of real communication were "missing" in the non-native speaker scenes that were included by the native speakers? (e.g. connectors, clarifying questions, and to what degree were some of these included by non-native speakers)

B. This three-part treatment of the topic of giving and receiving directions is excellent for stimulating teachers', both pre- and in-service, recognition of students' use of language for a meaningful communicative task. If it were used here at the University of Maryland, we would have the students complete several reading assignments related to "real" versus "contrived" communication. The type of material I would include might be something from either Renata Schulz or Paulston/Bruder who have attempted to identify a continuum of classroom exercises typically used by FL teachers. It might also be a useful exercise for the user to read one the references mentioned in the Instructor's Gruidebook (e.g. Krauss/Weinheimer, Glucksberg/Krauss/Weisberg, or Rose/Wang/Corey).

C. I suspect that it might be helpful to potential users to have a brief written description about the students in the scenes. That might help them understand something about the students' level of proficiency. While not essential, this information might anticipate some questions which potential users are likely to have. For example, many users of the videotapes may not be familiar with terms like "Spanish V" or "First Quarter," whereas they would probably understand a written description (sample only) such as the following:

- "The students in these scenes have all studied French/Spanish for at least three years. They were selected to participate in this project because they have a regular high school curriculum of FL instruction, namely five 45-minute classes per week, using a widely-used commercial Spanish textbook. These students, in general, received grades of A and B in their high school courses..."

D. With reference to the "Worksheet--shared Nomenclature," I would urge you to include an opportunity for teacher-users to suggest techniques which they feel would be useful in helping students overcome the "problems" identified in mumbers 1-3 of the sheet. Maybe you could include an "A" and a "B" part for each of these numbers, so that the user identifies problems (at least one) and proposes possible solutions.

E. Finally, I would recommend that these exercises (and perhaps all of them in your project) be correlated with a proficiency rating. For example, you may want to include an ACTFL/ETS rating (e.g. Novice-High, Intermediate-Low, etc.) for each of the participants who are included in the videotapes. While I realize that this suggestion would make it necessary that you return to the schools to have an ACTFL/ETS rating completed, I believe it would make for description of the participants in the supplementary materials. Even more important, perhaps, it would make it possible for you to coordinate your materials with activities of ACTFL, which as you know, is clearly moving ahead in the direction of encouraging a proficiency orientation for our profession. I could see us using video-tapes like this one in the state of Texas where a major three-year project for teacher training has been recently funded. Please talk to me about this aspect if you are interested. I see a connection, but there are many questions to be considered, of course.

FL Proficiency of Secondary School Students

Reading, Phonology and Repetition

(French)

Directions — 20 min. 35. sec.

None were given on the tape, so the manual/worksheet should definitely include some.

Evaluative Comments

Suggestions

A. In order to help the teacher-user (especially novice or pre-service teachers), you might want to include some introductory information about reading in the manual. I would suggest a brief statement regarding what happens when a second language "reads out loud" in the second/foreign language and perhaps some guiding questions to provoke thought about reading in L_2.

It might also be useful if the manual guided the teacher-user in comparing the results of the different students' oral production. Personally, I wish there had been some focus on meaning as part of the reading. In the manual, this focus on meaning might occur by having the teacher-user rate the comprehensibility of the students' production, rather than their phonetic accuracy. While there is an obvious connection, I would want teachers to focus on comprehensibility (e.g. to themselves as listeners). If that focus were stressed, there would be less of a need to think about correcting everything, and more of an inherent message from the tapes suggesting a focus on communicating meaning.

QUESTION: What is the correspondence between repetition of isolated sounds/phonemes and sounds/phonemes in context?

QUESTION: How can phonetic production indicate level(s) of comprehension during repetition and "reading out loud" tasks?

QUESTION: What is the role of memory in the exercises/tasks used in this tape?

Maybe questions such as these might be included in the manual (worksheets).

B. I liked the tape very much because it involved the students in interesting exercises. It seems to me that these types of activities can indeed be replicated in classrooms as a means of increased focus on pronunciation and memory in the FL classroom. In this sense, there are models for teacher-users to emulate.

C. Since there are three different tasks shown in this tape (Reading a passage aloud, pronunciation of nonsense words, and repetition of increasingly complex sentences), it would be beneficial for the teacher-user to be told what connection you envisage. Does each part intend to demonstrate some totally different aspect of phonology, or are they all related? You may also wish to indicate why these three tasks were selected.

D. The involvement of the teacher-user in completing a checklist (worksheets) during the viewing is very useful, I believe. However, the manual ought to include some potential use to which the acquired information can be put. What does it mean, for example, if the most advanced student in the "sentence repetition: complexity" segment had fewer overall unsuccessful attempts to repeat after the native? Does the fact that even she was unable to complete sentence 14 make a difference? Would one still rate her performance on this task to be excellent, which, incidentally, I did?

E. It seems to me that this tape would be excellent for use as an error analysis one. Teacher-users might work with the final task, for example, and identify the number of "miscues". In this case, I mean differences between what was <u>said</u> by the native speaker and the form or word used by the participating students. Would it not be potentially useful to the teacher-user to analyze what types of these miscues which occurred, including, of course, the self-corrections? They clearly might be asked to diagnose phonological strengths and weaknesses of the students included in the tape. Additionally, you might recommend this same technique in the manual as a follow-up activity for teacher-users to complete on their own, including the subsequent analysis of their student's performance.

F. On the whole, I rate this tape very high in its potential for use in various aspects of teacher education.

FL Proficiency of Secondary School Students

Reading for Meaning:
The Use of Syntactic and Semantic Cues in French

Directions — 19 min. 18 sec.

None were given on the tape, so the manual/worksheet should definitely include some.

Evaluation Comments

Suggestions

A. Involvement of students in "thinking out loud" activities such as this one is excellent. In several cases, the student answered that "it made sense, so I picked it." This response is very revealing in terms of this student's reasoning. It is always useful for a teacher to know how a student is reasoning.

QUESTION: How does the student's responses concerning his/her choices reveal different types of criteria he/she is using to choose a final multiple choice answer?

QUESTION: How does the use of a multiple choice format test a student's comprehension of a FL sentence or passage? Can that format be limiting in teaching a student reaining comprehension.

B. With respect to the format, I wonder if the teacher-user might not be asked, for example, in the worksheet or handbook to consider/discuss with another individual the relationship between success or failure in answering the eighteen multiple choice items and overall comprehension of the sentence from which the choices have been taken. Perhaps that discussion would lead them not only to review multiple choice testing procedures, including the selection of items to test for and item analysis but alo to think

C. My biggest reservation about this tape is that most of the student responses seemed to be guided by grammar, rather than by meaning criteria. If we wanted to test grammatical sensitivity, alone, this would have been a great tape. However, the goal was to test reading comprehension. If there had been a balance of meaning and grammar-driven examples, I would have been much less concerned. Ultimately, however, this tape could be used well in helping the teacher-user to analyze the relationship between grammar and comprehension in reading. If we believe, as I do, that reading is composed of three cue systems-graphophonic, semantic, and syntactic, then the activities of this tape can be used as part of a triple focus in reading, provided the teacher-user is encouraged to use tasks involving the other two cue systems.

D. The technical quality of this tape is slightly less good than some of the others because of the captions which move across the bottom of the screen. Since yellow is used for the sentences on an essentially light background, it is sometimes difficult to read the utterance. If it were done again, that should definitely be run on a darker background.

E. Several possible uses of this tape come to mind. First, it can be used to show teacher-users a specific technique for having their students think out loud. Second, the teacher-user may complete a modified (informal) item analysis of the three student results on this tape. Finally, it might be part of a triple focus on different cue systems as described in Item C above.

FL Proficiency of High School Students

Interviwing a Native Speaker

(Spanish)

Directions — 21 min. 57 sec.

The worksheet directions are good, but perhaps a more general direction to the teacher-user would be desireable.

Evaluative Comments

A. This videotape includes an excellent technique for having students functionally "use" the language they are studying. It offers the teacher-user an approach which can often work in a community where there are native speakers (even visitors) available for short interviews by foreign language students.

QUESTION: To what extent can discourse "acts" or behaviors be observed in contrived situations?

QUESTION: How does interviewee personality shape the interview, especially when the interviewers a not confident or full users of the second or foreign language?

QUESTION: Does age of the interviewer/interviewee make a difference in the performance of the interviewer (i.e. FL speaker)?

B. I was delighted to see this videotape with its focus on discourse analysis. It clearly indicates in a controlled manner some of the behaviors of limited-foreign language speakers when they interact with native speakers. I know that this is an important area, and I certainly want novice and even experienced teachers to focus on discourse markers as well as the varied forms of the FL.

C. Having established in Item B (above) that I favor a focus on discourse analysis as part of teacher education, I would urge that teacher-users who lack at least a minimal background be asked to do a little "homework." An article which I believe ties in very closely with the focus on this videotape is one by Dr. Gladys Nussenbaum entitled "Sociolinguistic Dimensions of Foreign and Second Language Teaching" (Foreign Language Annals, April 1983). Two quotes from that article may show why I feel it would be relevant: (1) "It seems appropriate to reexamine this distinction between foreign and second language instruction if students are to learn to communicate with native speakers of the target language...foreign language instruction should resemble second language teaching, expanding its scope and settings and making the 'classroom more like the street.'" (p, 122)

and

"With recent advances in the field of first (L_1) and second (L_2) language acquisition, however, the language teacher is now expected to provide at the earliest stages a milieu that will challenge the student's innate language acquisition mechanism and develop syntactic and grammatical structures through natural verbal interactions" (p. 123, underlying is mine).

D. I really like the worksheet because it includes specific tasks for the teacher-user to complete as part of the viewing process. My suggestion, however, is that a little more thought be put into the format of the sheet. Why not segment the sheet so that space for tallies is not only given but it might be marked in a more obvious way. Also, you may want to expand the descriptions of Group I, II, III. They seem too skeletal (to me) for use by the objective teacher-user. Finally, the four discussion questions listed at the bottom of the sheet are excellent, but I would add at least one other and modify the fourth item. For example, you might include questions such as the following:

4. (New) What do you conclude from discussions related to the first three questions?

4. (Revised) -- 5. (New)

What differences and similarities among the students did you observe in terms of the discourse "behaviors" demonstrated in the videotape?

E. My overall rating of the tape is excellent.

FL Proficiency of Secondary School Students

Spanish Story Retelling

Directions — 29 min. 06 sec.

None were given on the tape, so the manual/worksheet should definitely include some.

Evaluative Comments

Suggestions

A. One of my first reactions was the feeling that a teacher-user may want to replay the native-speaker reading of Blanca Nieves several times as part of listening comprehension for their own students.

B. It is also noteworthy that this tape indirectly shows that FL students may pool their resources (e.g., vocabulary) in a cooperative venture to communicate ideas to a native speaker. This activity should be presented, especially to novice teachers, to show that students can work together since so many school activities encourage competition, rather than cooperation.

C. I like the videotape, but I believe that it is too long. In my view, one of the student segments should be eliminated. After viewing this tape twice, I feel that there is not a tremendous difference in the level of language sophistication between the three groups of students. The worksheet asks the user to compare the language usage of the students, but the differences between groups I and II are not great. So, I would urge you to choose either I or II and keep group III. The second group seems to be less effective and perhaps "joke" just a little bit too much for my tastes.

D. The worksheet might also include a direction to the teacher-user for identifying the discourse (interaction) between the three FL students, especially the third group. They were obviously the most comfortable of the students and used more interactive behaviors. Some novice teachers may need to be guided to probe this aspect of the videotape, possibly with a follow-up discussion of how to help students at this level of sophistication with the language to overcome certain persistent errors before they become fossilized, in the Corder and Krashen sense. While these students have clearly achieved a goal to which we hope many FL students will aspire, it is certain that their language still contains errors.

E. It would be useful to link these students performance to the ACTFL-ETS ratings, a point which I have made previously with reference to another of your videotapes. That might help teacher-users to discuss the students' language behaviors in the oral skills with a common set of descriptions.

F. The worksheet for this videotape is excellent. It might be changed slightly to include more information to the teachers about "retelling" as an appropriate way to check a student's comprehension. It might also include less emphasis on specific facts and more emphasis on comprehension of the main message of the story Blanca Nieves. Finally, teacher-users might be asked to rate the students' level of comprehension based on their retelling. Maybe two ratings could be given, one group and one individual.

G. On the whole, a good tape.

Follow-up Discussion Questions:

QUESTION: What is the relationship between listening to a story (e.g. Blanca Nieves) for which the story is familiar and a listening task involving an unfamiliar story?

QUESTION: What is the impact of factors such as length, theme, language complexity or student retelling performance?

QUESTION: What would be the level of comprehension of the students' retelling a story such as Blanca Nieves to native speakers not used to dealing with Americans or foreigners?

QUESTION: How would each of the FL students in this project have performed the retelling task if they had been alone.

Giving & Taking Directions
(Shared Nomenclature)

Directions — 30 min. 00 sec.

Given in English

Evaluative Comments

Suggestions

A. As was the case in the Spanish counterpart to this Shared Nomenclature videotape, the French Students began immediately to give instructions to the other students, without setting the situation.

B. During the first team, the teacher's use of a question (Il n'y a pas de fautes?) to encourage the students to go further in correcting the listener excellent. She also used the same technique a second time when there still some problems in what the first student had heard.

C. Maybe the teacher-users should be asked (in some very direct manner) to "ignore" pronunciation problems initially sence the task rests on successful communication of a command. In other words, maybe the teacher-user needs to be told a bit about what not to look for as well as what to look for when using the videotape.

D. In the second group of students, there was an excellent use of real communication ("un moment s'il vous plaît," "o.k.," le coin gauche? Je ne comprends le dernier part. [Sic] Je ne comprends [sic] cette phrase.) The interaction of the two pupils at that point was excellent. Teacher-users should be asked to note that and possibly to discuss it. It is a very rich interaction in my view. Some of that same behavior was demonstrated by the third team, especially the listener. Both teams were demonstrating real communication behaviors.

E. There is also a richesse (of course!) in the interaction of the native speakers with respect to their communicative behaviors which should be exploited. This one, in my view, is very effective in showing the freedom with which native speakers can function. I would hope that the "user guide" can help the viewer to focus their observations on this linguistic behavior as well as the language used. I would say that this analysis is more important than the comparison of the non-native and the native-speaker interactions on the same task.

F. This module has excellent handouts. I believe it is one of the best in that regard.

QUESTION: What made some students able to communicate (e.g. ask for information, give it, react to it) while others operate systematically at a mechanical level of French usage?

QUESTION: What can we learn from an analysis of native speaker communicative behavior?

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROTOCOLS TO HELP TEACHERS UNDERSTAND AND INTERPRET THE ACQUISITION OF A FOREIGN LANGUAGE AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Comments and Suggestions:

Genelle Morain
Language Education
University of Georgia

Over-all comment:

My reaction to the protocol videotapes is very positive. I have also showed them for two other foreign language education specialists, a language arts specialist, and graduate students in foreign language education. The global response to the tapes is excellent. Students felt strongly that they would have profited from viewing and discussing these protocols in their methods classes. The professors asked in one voice, "Where can we get ahold of these?" I feel sure that the profession will benefit from having access to the protocol materials.

Some general suggestions:

1. It would be helpful if sound of some kind (appropriate music perhaps) could be added at the beginning of each tape during the interval when the credits are being displayed. The silence seems awkward to our audio-oriented ears. But more important, the teacher needs that sound to adjust the volume of the tape for the size of the room and the listening group.

2. It would improve every tape if a brief explanation of what is about to be shown could be presented at the beginning of the tape. Some tapes include a short assignment to the participants, but others plunge the viewer into the activity with no warning of what is to follow and what the purpose of the activity is. I am sure this will be included on the Teachers Guide, but the tapes should not be totally dependent on an accompanying guide. If a teacher 10 years from now comes across a tape separated from the guide, he/she should be able to flash the tape on the screen and know immediately what it's all about.

3. Tapescripts and Exercises for Viewers should be accompanied by English translations of all foreign language materials. Many methods courses and in-service workshops include teachers of several languages. While they can follow the techniques being demonstrated without knowing a specific language, the insights to be gained will be more dimensional if they have access to meaning as well.

4. Answer sheets should be provided to all questions that have specific responses. Everyone who uses the tapes may not have a strong background in linguistics or in both French and Spanish.

5. The three sections proposed for the Teacher's Guidebook (Background, Description, and Worksheets) are excellent. In addition, I would make the following suggestions:

   a. When citing research studies, follow each study with a sentence or two pointing out the relevance of that particular study for the protocol at hand. Untrained students and many classroom teachers might be unable to make connections between the studies and the activities viewed in the protocol materials. If no connection exists, eliminate the study.

   b. Add a fourth section to the Guidebook: Implications for the Classroom. Listed here could be suggestions for spin-off activities, and insights that language teachers should keep in mind as they create testing and/or teaching strategies of their own.

Some specific suggestions:

1. GIVING AND TAKING DIRECTIONS IN FRENCH

   a. Re-vamp the Viewers Guide to make it more efficient. The scheme currently proposed requires skipping up and down the page. (See one possible way to re-order it, attached.)

   b. Suggest in the Teachers Guidebook several ways to present this tape effectively. It lasts for 30 minutes, and a careful analysis of each level will require considerable time. Possible approaches might be:
      1) Show FR II students once, then replay so methods students can catch errors and insights they missed during initial showing. Hold discussion. Continue with other levels next period.
      or
      2) Play all levels through once. Then pass out tape scripts to aid methods students in marking their worksheets. Discuss next period.
      etc etc etc

   c. Question prompted by idle curiosity: why do you use the term "Shared Nomenclature" as a sub-title for this protocol? In the original "shared nomenclature" protocols the task involved one student giving a name to a nameless geometric form, describing it in such a way that the partner could recognize the shape, and "agreeing" on the term to be used thereafter (the nomenclature to be shared). On the FL videotapes a standard vocabulary is involved (chair, table, window, lamp). A student may not know every word, but students don't know every word in other protocols. I just don't see what the esoteric sub-title contributes.

   d. Cultural aside: I thought it was interesting that the native speaker began immediately to situate the task in a logical frame (French intellectualite; need for order, etc) In this case, "RAISON FAIT MAISON."

Viewers Guide for Giving & Taking Directions in French

(credits etc.)

Fill in the following chart as you watch the pairs of students from different grade levels complete the assigned task.

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS	Errors in Gender	Errors in Adjectival Agreement	Errors in Verb Tense	Errors in Vocabulary	Other Errors	Examples of Paraphrasing
French II						
French III						
French IV						
NATIVE SPEAKERS						

2. GIVING AND TAKING DIRECTIONS IN SPANISH

(Same comments as for previous protocol. Both of these tapes are interesting and have immediate appeal. They will doubtless spawn a proliferation of flannel boards throughout the land.)

3. INTERVIEWING NATIVE SPEAKERS IN SPANISH

Re: Viewers Guide

a. Clarify for benefit of viewers what you mean by "aspects of discourse" in the instructions.

b. The system of tallying proposed invites ambiguity. For instance, what is meant by "pieces of information"? If an informant says he lives in Mexico City, one viewer might tally this as a single piece of information (where lives); but another might consider it three pieces of information (he's an urban dweller, not rural; he lives in the city of Mexico City; he lives in the country of Mexico). To avoid arbitrary interpretations. you could devise a check list based on the content of the interviews. Listeners could be asked to check only those items which are specifically mentioned in the course of the interview. A rough example of such a scheme might be:

1) Residence

_____where born
_____city where resides
_____country where resides

2) Family

_____information re: parents
_____information re: siblings
_____other

3) Interests

_____sports _____ specific type
_____films _____ specific name
_____other hobbies

4) Education

_____amount
_____place
_____major area

5) Profession

_____

c. For Group II Viewers a similar check list might be devised, listing specific ways that interviewers "build" on information received. Studying this check list in advance of viewing the tape would serve to sensitize the viewers as to the kinds of language to look for. It would also provide a kind of master list of the devices that can be used to elicit additional information. Such a list would be helpful to teachers who want to teach interviewing skills.

d. Re Group III Viewers: In the follow-up discussion it should be pointed out that the interview is not a "normal conversation" in which "there is a give and take of information." Conventional interview technique restricts the role of the interviewer and throws a special kind of responsibility onto his/her shoulders.

One assignment for viewers might be to draw up a list of linguistic (and extra-linguistic) devices for drawing out, expanding on, easing away from, introducing new topics, and bringing to closure graciously--all skills needed by a successful interviewer.

e. This tape is a beautiful illustration of communicative competence: even 2nd and 3rd year students learned a satisfying amount of information, even if they lacked linguistic finesse.

4. FRENCH PHONOLOGY

a. Reading of passage: Why is it necessary to show the 2nd year student reading silently? (It might be interesting because it illustrates the fact that he is moving his lips as he sub-vocalizes.) But if this is so, what about the 5th year student? Since he isn't shown, we can't make any comparisons.

b. French Phonology: pronunciation of nonsense words
This is where the audience gets squirmy. The list is too long. Could it be cut down to 20 items?
Suggestion: Have a media specialist split the tape so that we hear/see the responses of the three different speakers juxtaposed for each word. This is the only way the listener can register pronunciation improvement with any impact. As it is now, there is no way to keep the differences in one's ear. One ends up with a tally on paper of rights and wrongs, but any interesting patterns in the ability to sight read sounds are lost.

c. Whether it is possible to carry out the above suggestion or not, I suggest that a sheet showing phonetic transcriptions of what each student said be included in the Viewers materials. (The instructor could withhold it until the viewers had practiced their own transcribing abilities, if desired.)

d. And--for the benefit of those instructors whose own pronunciation skills might "laisse a desirer"-- I suggest including an answer sheet of the correct pronunciations as anticipated by a native speaker.

e. Sentence repetition: length
Basically o.k. The discussion section might point out that not only is sheer length a factor here, but "expectation of the familiar" as well. A hundred dialogues have trained us to go to the cinema "ce soir." Any other two words might cause a stumble: "Je vais au cinema a Lyon," for example.

f. Sentence repetition: complexity
This one bothers me. I think you need to make very clear just what constitutes "complexity." Again, does familiarity play a role? An unfamiliar verb tense might not be more complex linguistically than a familiar one, but if it is new it will cause problems. The factor of length would also seem to enter in. It might have been better to keep all sentences the same length, to contrast this exercise with the one above.
A good discussion of these problems will be needed in the Viewers Guide.

5. READING FOR MEANING: THE USE OF SYNTACTIC AND SEMATIC CUES IN FRENCH

a. Suggested approach for methods students: Have students go through identical reading passage before viewing tape and enter their own strategies on the worksheet chart. This will prepare them for analyzing student responses more accurately and rapidly.

b. To make sure viewers know the difference between "systactic" and "semantic" clues, spell out the distinction and give some examples.

c. As with all questions, include answers in Guidebook.

d. Technical point: When the letters (words on tape) pass in front of yellow curtains, flesh-colored hands, and other light objects, they are difficult to read. Could they be projected on a thin black band?

e. In the text, there appears the phrase (6) surtout des souvenirs de dimanche. In the title the wording is LES SOUVENIRS DU DIMANCHE. Is this discrepancy worth noting?

6. STORY RETELLING IN SPANISH

An interesting tape--lively, for the most part. Dividing the viewers into two groups, each with a separate task to perform, is a good idea. This is a good example of the need for including an English translation of foreign language scripts (Group I Viewers Guide). A lot of classes who use the tapes will have students who don't understand Spanish very well--if at all.

a. This tape provides good material for a discussion of socio-liquistic factors. It would be helpful to have a run-down of the composition of the three groups of students. Do they know each other already or are they strangers? How do the dynamics of the group influence linguistic output? (In one group, the boy seized the conversational reins and ran off with the plot; the two girls seemed to feel unsure of their roles and projected a feeling of exasperation--of being "cut out of" the conversation. Doubtless their contribution would have been richer if they had felt a part of the narration of events from the beginning.) The last group had superior language skills, but they also had a shared feeling of enjoyment, humor, and liking for each other. This protocol demonstrates the critical influence of social context on communicative competence (and linguistic competence as well).

APPENDIX C

Article entitled "Shared Nomenclature:" . . .

Edward D. Allen

Shared Nomenclature: An Analysis of Students' Communicative Strategies in a Foreign Language

A grant from the U.S. Department of Education, International Research and Studies, enabled us to create a series of protocols that shed light on the developmental stages of second language acquisition among secondary school students.[1] The protocols consist of learning tasks in which students communicate in French or Spanish with each other or with native speakers. Each protocol is designed to illustrate a concept of second-language acquisition based on research in this field. All the protocols have been developed so that the various communicative strategies and levels of achievement can be analyzed.

Two of the videotapes are entitled "Giving and Taking Directives in French" and "Giving and Taking Directives in Spanish: Shared Nomenclature."

The term "shared nomenclature" refers to the ability of two or more students of very similar linguistic backgrounds to communicate; the use of the word "share" indicates that the students are able to understand one another as they ask and answer questions at their particular level of achievement, and the word "nomenclature" means that they have acquired the same vocabulary.

Research Background

In 1964 Krauss and Weinheimer[2] investigated the ways in which adults communicate information when they take the roles of speakers and listeners. Pairs of visually separated college students

cooperated in a task which required them to communicate in English (their native language) about novel graphic forms. Although the speaker in each pair used distinctive names for each object, the listeners had no difficulty identifying the objects and manipulating them according to instructions.

The same set of graphic forms was used in three experiments with children in nursery schools in Princeton, New Jersey.[3] One of the purposes of the experiments was to illustrate the utility of a method for studying referential communication in children. Pairs of children, separated by an opaque screen, were asked to communicate with each other in performing a task. The child on one side of the screen looked at a completed task; the child on the other side of the screen had pieces of the task which were to be assembled according to instructions given to him by his partner. The results showed that, unlike adults, nursery school children were unable to converge upon a shared nomenclature for the novel form, i.e., the names they gave to the objects were not mutually intelligible. However, when adults gave instructions, these children were able to perform the tasks reasonably well.

A similar experiment was done in 1973 by Rose, Wang, Maxwell and Corey.[4] The Language Communication Skills Task (LCST) was developed as a technique to study the nature of language communication among young children, and to assess the effectiveness of their language communication competencies. The LCST was administered to a pair of children at a time, with one playing the "message

prescriber" role and the other playing the "message receiver" role. The presenters job was to tell the receiver WHAT object to pick up and WHERE it was to be placed. Results showed that the young child's ability to use verbal skills (language) in a functional setting is not significantly affected by his linguistic competency.

A film, entitled, "Shared Nomenclature" was produced for a 1974 research project at The Ohio State University. It was a protocol in which the acquisition of young children's first language was illustrated. This earlier study served as a model for the research reported in the present article.

Description of the Shared Nomenclature Videotapes

Two pairs of students participated in the Spanish videotape, three in the French. The Spanish students were in their third and fifth year of study; the French were in their second, third and fourth year. An effort was made to select pairs of students whose oral ability in Spanish or French was equal.

The final portion of each videotape contains native speakers of Spanish and French performing the same task that the American students were asked to do. We were thus able to compare and contrast native speakers' speech with that of the American high school students.

The subjects in this study come from two public schools in a large metropolitan area. A large percentage of the students in these two schools are college-bound. The foreign language teachers adhere to a carefully articulated sequence of courses with objectives

clearly defined for each level of language study.

We asked the teachers to select their "best students" for the following reason: in our pilot study we visited numerous French and Spanish classes in several high schools and were unable to discern differences in levels of achievement, i.e., we could not have been able to distinguish an "average" second-year student from an "average" third or fourth-year student. Thus, we reasoned that only foreign language departments that strictly attended to articulation could provide us with the type of subjects we needed. The "best students" exhibited in this study the kind of achievement it is possible to attain given the limitations of time in two schools with a large percentage of college-bound students.

The Language Task

In order to perform the language task, each pair of students sat at a table with a blind between them so that they could not see each other. On one side of the blind was a picture of a dining room. On the other side of the blind was a flannel board alongside of which were cut-out pieces of the same objects as those in the picture. Student A of each pair tried to describe in Spanish or French the exact position of each object in the picture. Student B, on the other side of the blind, placed the cut-out pieces on the flannel board as he or she listened to Student A's description. Both students could ask and answer questions in Spanish or French in order to help student B complete the picture. In performing this task the students demonstrated their ability to give a name

(nomenclature) to the objects and communicate directions to their partners, thus, the name "shared nomenclature."

The Spanish Videotape

The following is a dialog of two third-year students of Spanish (1st quarter).

1 pone la puerta a la izquerda, el norte izquierda - Put the door on the left, the north left

2. ah...

1 la ventana a la derecha norte, pone la mesa en el centro, ah, los flores - the window on the north right, put the table in the center, ah, the flowers

2 sí - Yes

1 en la mesa - on the table

2 izquierda? - left?

1 centro - center

2 pardón? - pardon?

1 el centro dos cosas que sentar - the center, two things to sit on

2 cómo? - What?

1 dos cosas que sentar - two things to sit on

2 las sillas? - the chairs?

1 sí la silla blanca a la izquierda de la mesa y la silla amarilla a la derecha - Yes, the white chair to the left of the table and the yellow chair to the right

2 ok

1 dónde esta la silla blanca? - Where is the white chair?

uh - sur de la puerta un poco? - south of the door, a little

1 pone al gato después de...el sur de la mesa en el centro - Put the cat after...the south of the table in the center

2 un hum

1 la lámpara pone en la mesa más baja a la derecha sur - the lamp, put on the table lower on the right south

2 más baja? - lower?

1 a la derecha sur después de la ventanilla-ventana - on the right south, after the window

2 sí

1 dónde está los flores? - Where are the flowers?

2 en el centro de la mesa? sí la mesa pequeña donde - in the middle of the table? Yes, the little table where...

1 dónde está la lámpara? - Where is the lamp?

2 en el norte derecha - on the north right

1 norte? - north?

2 sí - yes

1 la lámpara? no, en el sur a la derecha - the lamp? no, on the south at the right

2 cerca de la puerta? - near the door?

1 no, la ventana es en la mesa más pequeña - no, the window is on the smaller table

2 sí es cerca de la silla amarilla - yes, it's near the yellow chair

1 sí, a la derecha a la derecha de la silla amarilla - Yes, on the right, on the right of the yellow chair

ok

Discussion: The students were able to perform the task accurately and rapidly, despite their errors in morphology and lexicon. Their paraphrasing for "above" and "below" was "norte" (north) and "sur" (south), which they mutually understood. One student said "dos cosas que sentar" (two things to sit on) to which his partner replied, "Las sillas" (the chairs). The error in the imperative, "Pone la puerta" (place the door), did not impede comprehension, and neither did the incorrect gender of "flores" (flowers).

The following is the fifth year students' dialog.

1 en la pintura hay una puerta - On the painting there's a door.

2 sí, yo tengo ok. - Yes, I have OK

1 La puerta está encima--está abajo a la izquierda - The door is above--it's below on the left

2 abajo a la izquierda, sí. sí, totalmente al izquierda? en el esquina? - below on the left, yes. Yes, totally on the left? in the corner?

1 sí - yes

2 el, la cosa que usas para abrir la puerta es en la derecha? - Yes, the thing you use to open the door is on the right

1 es en la derecha de la puerta. sí. It's on the right of the door

2 bien vamos. - O.K., let's go.

1 debajo de la puerta hay una silla blanca - Below the door there's a white chair.

2 debajo? - below?

1 debajo - below

1 sí - Yes

2 a la-al lado de o debajo de? - to the side or below?

1 uh - debajo - below

2 debajo - below

1 si, acerca de, es debajo, es debajo de - Yes, near, it's below, it's below

2 debajo y a la izqu--a la derecha? - below on the left--on the right?

1 no directamente debajo--directamente debajo - not directly below ...directly below

2 La puerta está en la esquina más arriba del cielo? - The door is is in the corner higher than the sky?

1 uh. más arriba? - higher?

2 La esquina arriba de la izquierda - the corner above the left

1 sí. sí. Yes. Yes.

2 yo tengo - I have

1 directamente debajo de la puerta - directly below the door

2 Sí. La silla blanca - Yes. The white chair

1 Sí, Sí Al lado de la silla hay una mesa - Yes, Yes, beside the chair there's a table

2 una mesa hay dos cosas que... - a table; there are two things that...

1 Es la mesa grande y café - It's the big, brown table.

2 Sí, hay dos mesas y un grande--puerto - Yes, there are two things and a big door

1 Sí, necesitas el grande - Yes, you need the big one.

2 el grande Sí. yo tengo - the big one. Yes. I have.

1 bueno, debajo de la mesa - good, below the table

2 debajo de la mesa el gato - below the table, the cat

1 Sí, el gata, gato, amarillo - Yes, the cat, cat, yellow

2 muy bien y - very good and

1 abajo de en la mesa hay un uh... - below, on the table there's a...

2 Flores? - flowers?

1 Sí, Vaso de Flores - Yes. A glass of flowers

2 Sí hay otra, otro sillo, - yes, there's another, another chair

1 sí - Yes

2 el otro... - the other one

1 Sí--es a la derecha del mesa grande - Yes, it's on the right of the big table

2 bien, hay tres cosas más. - good, there are three more things.

1 Sí a la derecha de la silla amarilla y un poco debajo en el rincón a la debajo del papel hay una mesa pequeña. - Yes, on the right of the yellow chair and a little below in the corner below the paper there's a small table.

2 Sí - Yes

1 Y encima de la-- - And above the

2 una lampa? - a lamp

1 Sí. roja y uh. - Yes, red and uh.

2 amarillo - yellow

1 amarillo. y en el rincón a la derecha al lado - yellow. And in the corner on the right at the side.

2 arriba? - above?

1 arriba. Sí. Above. Yes.

2 es todo al arriba o en el medio - It's entirely above or in the middle

1 más, mucho como la puerto - more, much like the door.

2 como es casi en la esquina - like it's almost in the corner

1 sí, es igual de la puerta - Yes, it's equal from the door

2 Sí - Yes.

1 pero en la derecha-La ventana. - but on the right-the window.

Discussion: An interesting paraphrase occurred in this dialog when student 1 could not produce the word for doorknob; he said, "la cosa que usas para abrir la puerta" (the thing you use to open the door). This phrase did not, however, impede comprehension.

The fifth-year students also exhibited greater knowledge of lexicon, particularly in their use of prepositions, prepositional phrases and adverbs, i.e., "abajo, debajo, arriba, al lado, en el rincón, en la esquina" (below, underneath, above, beside, in the corner).

Another phenomenon that was present in the more advanced students' rejoinders was their ability to predict; such as the case when student 2 asked in Spanish if the flowers and lamp should be put on the table and the cat underneath it.

The Spanish native speakers exhibited much precision in their directions, using "un dedo" or "medio dedo" (a finger, half a finger) to express the positions of the objects.

The French Videotape

Similar instances of developmental differences were revealed in the French videotapes on shared nomenclature.

The pair of French 2 students completed the task quickly and efficiently, even though they made errors in gender and adjectival agreement, i.e., "le petit table," "le lampe," "le porte," and "la chaise blanc." As in the Spanish protocol, this presented no comprehension problem.

Their paraphrasing for directions took the form of "près de terre," and "vers le ciel," and "vers les étoiles" (near the earth, toward the sky, toward the stars).

In the case of gender usage, there was, strangely, little or no increase in accuracy from the speech of second-year to that of fourth-year French students.

Third year students showed much better control of directional phrases. They said, "au bas de la page," "la fenêtre en haut," "dans le centre," "dans le milieu" (the window above, in the center).

One of the third-year students said, "à votre rive," for "to your left." He was undoubtedly thinking of "la rive gauche" (the left bank) from his readings on Paris.

The fourth-year students showed that they had acquired a much greater vocabulary than the less advanced groups. They attempted to be very precise in their use of directions, often using centimeters to express distances, e.g., "le petit table est un centimètre de le côté à droite--," and "en ligne avec le bas de la porte" (the little table is one centimeter on the side at the right, and

in line with the bottom of the door).

Their rendition of the word, doorknob, was "le cercle noir à droite sur la porte" (the black circle at the right on the door). For "above," they used "le sommet."

The French native speakers exhibited great precision in their directions. To indicate the position of the cat's ears, one native speaker said, "Ses oreilles ne touchent pas tout à fait le dessous de la table, mais il y a peut-être un demi-centimètre entre ses oreilles" (His ears barely touch the bottom of the table; there is perhaps a half-centimeter between his ears). The table was expressed by, "La table est peut-être à un centimètre du bord vertical sur le côté" (The table is perhaps one centimeter from the vertical side of the picture).

Analysis of the Protocols and Implications for Foreign Language Instruction

The purpose of the protocols on shared nomenclature was to study the communicative strategies of pairs of secondary school students as they gave and took directions in French or Spanish. The subjects in this research had completed one, two, three, or four years of French or Spanish in junior and senior high schools.

The most impressive finding of the study was that students could indeed speak to and understand one another in French or Spanish, even after only one year of instruction. Their utterances contained many errors in grammar and vocabulary, but this did not impede their comprehension. When they did not know certain key

vocabulary words they used ingenious paraphrases and circumlocutions, an indication that they truly considered language a vehicle of communication.

The amount of language used by the students and the median length of their utterances were also factors of interest in this research. The total number of words spoken by the third and fifth year Spanish students was 33 and 59 respectively; thus, the fifth year Spanish students' output was almost twice that of the third year students.

The total number of words spoken by the second, third, and fourth year French students was 34, 45 and 91; the fourth year students' output was, thus, three times greater than that of the second year. The median length of utterance in the third year was 4 words; that of the fourth year was 7.

On the average, 25% of the utterances in all the dialogs were in the form of questions. It is interesting to observe that most of the questions were one to three words in length, such as, "above?", "below?", "to the left?" Perhaps these data suggest that teachers need not always insist on complete sentences in preparing their students for communicative competence. The brief questions in the dialogs were adequate for complete comprehension.

As predicted, the students from fourth and fifth year classes exhibited a larger range of vocabulary, controlled more tenses, produced more language and spoke longer utterances than the second and third year students. This finding, then, provides some evidence

for the inclusion of longer sequences of language study in secondary school curricula.

The native speakers of French and Spanish began the task with "an advanced organizer," i.e., "This is a picture of a dining room." None of the American high school students did this. We wonder if the native speakers, who were older, were exhibiting a difference in their cognitive development, or whether this was a cultural difference. Are students in other educational systems taught to synthesize at the beginning of an explanation or a report? This might be worthy of further research.

One of the factors that would be worthy of investigation in a future study is the role-taking ability of pairs of students. Some students are better at giving directions and others at receiving them. Poor intercommunication outcomes might thus be attributed to the presenter who tends to give non-precise or incomplete information. Role-reversal, then, might make a difference in the outcome.

The findings of this research indicate that students with limited control of French or Spanish can indeed communicate in the language. What does this mean for classroom instruction? It suggests that we provide students with frequent opportunities to perform tasks requiring real communication. It also implies that communication can occur even when grammar and vocabulary are imperfect.

Another important implication of this study is the need to supply a context for purposeful communication. The dining room scene allowed for sustained speech. Not infrequently in foreign

language classrooms, we hear a series of discrete questions and answers.

The results of these protocols are encouraging. They show that longer sequences of second-language study clearly enable students to express themselves with ever increasing precision and depth.

Notes

[1]"The Development of Protocols to Help Teachers Understand and Interpret the Acquisition of a Foreign Language Among Secondary School Students," U.S. Department of Education, International Research and Studies, Title VI, 1981-1983.

[2]Krauss, R.M. and Weinheimer, S. Changes in the length of reference phrases as a function of social interaction: a preliminary study." Psychom. Sci, 1964, I, 113-114.

[3]Glucksberg, S., Krauss, R.M., and Weisberg, R. "Referential Communication in Nursery School Children: Method and Some Preliminary Findings." Journal of Experimental Child Psychology 3, 333-342 (1966).

[4]Rose, Suzanna, Wang, M.C., Maxwell, J., and Corey, E. "The Development of a Measure to Evaluate Language Communication Skills of Young Children." University of Pittsburgh Learning Research and Development Center, 1973.